

influence of literature is by far the best. There is this expansion of the citta in all cases, excepting in those who are unusually resistant to all sense of beauty. This is the moment of aesthetic enjoyment. All the particular phases of the citta are comprehended in this state, when the citta, which is at balance, pervades all particular phases of it. There is no conflict in this state being present in all these different manifestations of the citta. But no particular manifestation can be comprehended in another particular manifestation ; because particulars are always at war with one other. The universal content of gold is present in all particular manifestations of it, in the shape of necklace, or a bangle or a bracelet. But a necklace is not comprehended in a bangle ; and it can never be. If it were possible to enjoy the universal content of Rasa, underlying all particular manifestations of it, like Sringara and Hasa, or Madhura and Amla, then the delight arising out of it, would be unlimited. But the enjoyment of a particular manifestation can never give this uncircumscribed and unlimited sense of delight. The citta which has regained its balance, is not impeded in any way. But the limited citta, with its motivations, is almost always impeded, and is a bar to the free and detached enjoyment of aesthetic pleasure.

The great importance of Vibhavas is to be studied, from this stand-point. Vibhavas help in the restoration and gaining back of the original balance. It has already been noticed that this balanced state is the universal content of all particular manifestations. Vibhavas which replenish the lost sufficiency, thus help in gaining back the original balance, just as ahara in Ayurveda is to make good the deficiency of depleted dhatus, as also of the mala dhatus (Caraka. Sutra-sthanam. 28.3). Caraka in Sutra-sthanam. 28.2. writes, how a balance of dhatu and mala must be effected. In 28.3, he says further that just as bodies are the result of foods and drinks, so also diseases are born out of foods and drinks. It is useful to remember that bodies are 'bhava', a source of troubles and disquiet. There is happiness only when the bhava is free from the play of Rajas and Tamas. This freedom is possible, because there is Sakti, which is of the nature of aprakrita visuddha sattva.

Bharata in Ch. VI describes the process of Rasa-realisation. In p. 288-9 of *Natya-Sastra* (G.O.S.) Vol. I, Bharata writes, "Yatha hi nanavyanjanusadhi-dravya-samyogadrasa-nishpattir bhavati. Yatha hi-gudadibhir-dravyair-vyanjanau-sadhibhischa sadabadayoo rasa nirvartante tatha nana-bhavopagata apl sthayino bhava rasattvam-apnuvanti . . . Yatha hi nanavyanjana-samskritam annam bhunjana rasanaswadayanti sumanassa purusa harsadinschadhigacchanti, tatha nanabhavabhinnayavyanjita vagangasattvapetan sthayibhavan-aswadayanti sumanassa prekshaka . . . adhigacchanti".⁵⁵ This illustrative reference to the evolution of Rasa has been taken to mean that Bharata was drawing upon paka-sastra, and had nothing to do with the wider philosophical background of the problem, which underlies the speculations of both Bharata and Ayurveda. Mm. P. V. Kane in his "History of Sanskrit Poetics", p. 346 (1951) notes how Bharata's Rasa-concept was influenced by paka-sastra. The textual support of Mm. Kane and of those others who are satisfied with explaining away Bharata's Rasa-sutra as a branch of paka-sastra, seems to be the following statement of Abhinavagupta. Abhinavagupta writes explaining the text of Bharata. "Dravyam gudadi esam pakakramena samyagyojanarupat-kusala-sampadyat-samyogat". Again "etaduktam bhavati. Pakarupaya samyag-yojanaya tarat-alaulika rasa jayate". These texts have been interpreted to mean that the background of Bharata's Rasa-speculations is the paka-sastra.

But it appears that when Bharata was speaking of the evolution of Rasa, and Abhinavagupta was comparing the process of evolution as very similar to that in Paka-sastra, they are thinking only of the change that comes over bhava as a result of paka. The root "pacati" means not merely cooking ; it also means "coming to a fruition" or a change. This last meaning comprehends all the different senses in which paka may be used. Abhinavagupta in speaking of paka was referring to the change which comes over bhava at the moment of Rasa-realisation. Paka pre-supposes the existence of Sakti. Bharata's awareness of the presence of Sakti in Rasa enjoyment is evident once again in his

reference to visuddha-sattva as the soul of Rasa. (See Chs. IV and V).

The fruition of anna is not in itself ; it looks forward to apa. The fruition of apa again is not in itself ; it looks forward to tejas. It appears that the Chandyoga Upanishad tacitly recognises the gradual evolution and refinement of tejas from its first beginnings in anna. The activity of tejas thus presupposes the existence of both anna, which is of the nature of ahara, and apa which is prana. This is very striking, for anna without apa, cannot undergo any change. If anna had been heated alone without any apa, anna itself would be destroyed, and there would be no paka. If on the other hand, apa had been heated without anna, there could again be no change, for pure apa without an admixture with kshiti, does not undergo a change. Paka is only possible when anna in annamaya kosha mixes with apa in the prana-maya kosha, and the two together are processed by fire or tejas of the manomaya kosha. This is the paka, which Bharata and Abhinavagupta had in mind, when they spoke of Rasa-evolution as the result of paka. Rasa-evolution is only a processing and a change of the original ahara in the form of vibhava, and its gradual sublimation in the manomaya stage. The Vaicesika analysis speaks of this paka, which comes over "kshiti" in the presence of water. Pure water, however it may be heated, undergoes no change. But in the presence of earth, an apparent change comes over water. This change, according to the Valcesika analysis, takes place in the atomic plane, or in paramanu. (Bhasa-pariccheda. 105). So also "anna" in the presence of "apa" shows marks of change, when tejas is applied to it. This is the paka, spoken of by the Upanishads, as also in the Vaicesika system, This is also the paka, spoken of by Bharata and Abhinavagupta, as meaning only a change from one state to another. The emergence of Rasa from bhava is as definitely a change from one state to another, as the preparation of soup from its raw materials and ingredients. It should be noted that while Bharata stops with the manomaya kosha, where the work of tejas begins, the Upanishads pass on to discuss further stages of sublimation in akasa, smriti and asa (Chandyogya, 7, 12-14). It is well-known how this analysis leads to more and more comprehension, until the perfection of bhuma is reached (Chandyogya. 7, 24.2). But it appears

that Bharata feels that a work of art cannot proceed with this purificatory process beyond the sattva-suddhi stage. This stage is confined to manomaya kosha. This is possible because the concept of paka, which has very largely dominated early aesthetic speculations, is also centred in manas, which is the seat of tejas.

VI

Caraka's ahara-mulabhyam rasa together with the Upanishadic ahara-suddhau sattva-suddhi seems to have paved the way for Bharata's Rasa-speculations. If Rasa be rooted in ahara, then good and healthy food should make for a healthy mind. The Chandogya Upanishad (7.26.2) writes how beginning with ahara-suddhi, a process is set in motion which leads to emancipation. With ahara-suddhi, the sattva becomes purified ; with the purification of sattva, steadfast smriti or memory is to be had ; and with the attainment of this perfection of memory, which knows no limitations of space and time, the citta is set free. The great importance of this passage from the Chandogya Upanishad is that here it is clearly recognised that the mind is entirely dependent on the nature and quality of food, that is taken in by the body.

This concept of the necessity of having purified ahara for the attainment of a purified sattva, seems to have deeply influenced the speculations of the writers on rasa. The insistence on having particular vibhavas or aharas in the case of particular Rasas, seems also to proceed from this consideration. For instance, in the case of Sringara, the appropriate vibhavas are according to Bharata,

Rtu-malayalam karai janagandharba-kavya-sevabhi
Upavana-gamana-viharai sringara-rasa samudbhavati⁵⁶
(G.O.S. vol. I. 6.54).

In the case of Hasya, the appropriate vibhavas or aharas again, are sa cha vikrita-paravesalamkara-dharstya-laulya kuhakasatpralapa-vyanga-darsana dosa - daharanadibhirvi-bhava-rupadyate.⁵⁷ (G.O.S. v. 1 p. 313-4), and so on with each of these Rasas. It has already been noticed how close is the

parallelism between the after-effects of a treatment with madhura and the attendant effects of sringara, or those of amla with their counterparts in hasa. What is to be noted here is this. Just as certain specific things, unmixed with others, are prescribed for particular Rasas in Ayurveda, so also certain vibhavas which are no less ahara than those prescribed in Ayurveda, contribute to the evolution of particular Rasa.

The prescription of particular ahara for the promotion of a specific Rasa is well-known in Ayurveda. In Sutra-sthanam, Ch. 27, Caraka discusses different ahara or anna, as contributing to the evolution of these different Rasas. In this chapter on appropriate food and drinks, Caraka discusses in detail how different kinds of food help promote a particular Rasa. This knowledge is very important for the physician of the body, as also for the physician of the soul. Caraka discusses for instance, the Rasa-content of different varieties of paddy with tendrils (Sutra. 27. 5-9), of different kinds of meat as contributing to these different Rasas (Sutra. 27, 10-25). Caraka discusses the Saka-varga, the phala-varga, the hariṭa-varga, the nadya-varga, jala-varga, dugdha-varga, ikshu-varga and many more. Caraka discusses in all twelve categories of food (Sutra. 27.62). All these are contributing to the development of the body and the soul. In Sutra-sthanam 28.2, Caraka writes how rasa, rakta, mamsa, meda, asthi, majja, sukra and ojas are all rooted in ahara. "Pusyanti twāhara - rasadrasa - rudhira - mamsa - medosthi-majja-sukraujamsi pancendriya-dravyani dhatu-prasada-samjnakani".⁵⁸ Again, Caraka writes if there be an increase or decrease of bodily rasa, appropriate ahara to restore the balance of disturbed Rasas, might be prescribed (Sutra. 28.2). This is so because rasas being rooted in ahara, can be augmented or diminished by appropriate ahara. (Sutra. 28.2).

In Sutra-sthanam. 28.5, Caraka looks at sound, touch, vision, taste and smell as all different forms of ahara. These aharas when unsuitable or unpalatable, give rise to diseases as much as change of seasons, parinama or prajnaparadha. The great importance of vibhava in the evolution of Rasa is to be looked at from this standpoint. Bharata writes,

आहारेऽधिष्ठिताः प्राणाः प्राणे योग्याः प्रतिष्ठिताः ॥
 तस्माद्योग्यप्रसिध्यर्थमाहारे यन्नवान् भवेत् ।
 अशुद्धकार्यं प्रह्वान्तमतीवक्षुत्पिपासितम् ॥
 अतिपीतं तथा भुक्तं व्यायामं नैव कारयेत् । (59)

(G.O.S. V. 2. Ch. 10. 100b-102a)

Though Bharata is speaking of Carividhana, it is useful to remember that his use of the word "ahara" in the above context has almost universal validity, and applies to all forms of ahara. Bharata says in the strain of Caraka, ahare adhithitha prana This being so, just as the good physician carefully chooses proper diet, so also the good poet and the dramatist should be particularly careful about appropriate vibhavas. In Ch. 10, 97-100a, Bharata writes again,

सन्धानं शरविन्यासं विक्षेपो भोक्षणं भवेत् ।
 तैलाम्यक्तो न गात्रेण यवागूमृदितेन च ॥
 व्यायामं कारयेद्दीमान् भित्तिवाकाशिके तथा ।
 योग्यायां भानुका भित्तिस्तम्भादियत्तिं समाश्रयेत् ॥
 भित्तिं प्रसारितांस्तु व्यायामं कारयेन्नरम् ।
 वलाथं च निषेवेत नस्यं वस्तिविधिं तथा ॥
 स्निग्धान्यन्नानि च तथा रसकं पानकं तथा । (60)

The background of this passage from Bharata is to be sought in Caraka and Susruta. There is little difficulty about the presence of the concept of ahara in the kindred speculations of Bharata, and those of Caraka and Susruta. What is even more significant is this. Bharata takes over the details, regarding vyayama and their bearing on the question of purgation.

Four distinct stages are clearly marked out in Bharata's analysis. These stages exactly correspond to their counterparts, in the treatment of the physieal body in Caraka and Susruta. These stages in Bharata are (1) to get rubbed with oil (10.97); (2) after being rubbed with oil, to do some physieal exercise in the gymnasium (10.98); (3) the third stage, is to be purgated with snuffs or cathetar (10.99). The last stage after being treated with snuffs and

cathetar, is taking in wholesome food (10. 100). All these stages can be traced in Caraka's analysis of vata-vyadhi (Cikitsa-sthanam. Ch. 28). This again is highly significant, for ahara which lies at the root of Rasa, is essentially an activity of vayu, operating with hrdaya.

Caraka in Siddhi-sthanam, Ch. 1. 17, speaks of the wholesome effects of oil in counteracting diseases of vayu.

न तैलादानात् परमस्ति किञ्चित् द्रव्यं विशेषेण समीरणात् ।

सोहाद्वि रौक्ष्यं लघुतां गुरुत्वादौष्णाच्च शैत्यं पवनस्य हत्वा ॥

तैलं ददात्याशु मनःप्रसादं वीर्यं बलं वर्णमयाग्निपुष्टिम् ॥⁽⁶¹⁾

There is nothing like oil in counteracting vayu. For oil being of a sneha nature, removes the ruksmata of the body ; being of a heavy and viscous nature, it removes the rapidity and lightness of vayu ; and being of a warm nature, it works against the coldness of vayu and quickly tranquillises the mind, and thus contributes to the development of strength and brightness, appetite and growth. In Sutra-sthanam. 5. 30-1, Caraka speaks again of how oil counteracts the unbalance produced by vayu.

न कर्णरोग वातोत्था न मन्याहनुसंग्रहः ।

नोच्चैः श्रुतिर्नव्यधिर्व्यं स्यान्नित्यं कर्णतर्पणात् ॥

... ..

स्पर्शने चाधिको वायुः स्पर्शनञ्चत्वगाश्रितम् ।

त्यच्चश्च परमोऽभ्यग स्तम्भात् शीलयेन्तरः ॥

Bharata's dependence on Ayurvedic speculations in his analysis of Cari-vidhana is so manifest, that even Abhinava-gupta is forced to admit that purgations and administration of oil are all from Ayurveda. Tasya vasti-vidhischa talia-ghritadibhi yathadesakala-prakrititi mantabyamayurvedat. (Abhinava-Bharati. v. 2. p. 116). Abhinava combines two separate processes together, which on a closer analysis belong to the two distinct stages.

After having been rubbed with oil, the young man does physical exercises. This second stage in Bharata's analysis is a distinct echo of Caraka's Sweda-adhya (Sutra-sthanam. ch. 14). Caraka notes how in almost all types of Sweda, the patient has first to be rubbed and treated with oil. This is

so in "prāstaraswēda" (Sūtra. 14.17), in "nādi-swēda" (Sūtra. 14.18), "pariseka-swēda" (Sūtra. 14.19), "ābagaha-swēda" (Sūtra. 14.20), "jēntaka-swēda" (Sūtra. 14.21), "asma-swēda" (Sūtra. 14.22), "kūti-swēda" (Sūtra. 14.24), "bhu-swēda" (Sūtra. 14.25), "kumbhi-swēda" (Sūtra. 14.26), "kūpa-swēda" (Sūtra. 14.27) and "hōlaka-swēda" (Sūtra. 14.26), "kūpa-swēda" (Sūtra. 14.27) and "hōlaka-swēda" (Sūtra. 14.28).⁶³ It appears that Bharata had a very intimate knowledge of this treatment through swēda, practised in Ayurveda. The swēda-treatment of which Bharata speaks in Ch. 10, is niragni-swēda. It naturally follows that Bharata should speak of vyāyama as one of the recognised methods for bringing about swēda. (Ch. 10, 98). It is highly interesting to note that Caraka also speaks of Vyāyama as one of the tested niragni-swēda, widely used by the physicians (Sūtra-sthanam. 14.29). The predominance of Vayu in Swēda has again to be discussed in Ch. VII, where it would be seen that all Sattvika-bhavas are the result of Vayu-vikara.

The third stage in Bharata's analysis is one of the most frequently used practices in Indian medicine. This is, as Bharata says, balartham cha niseveta nasyam bastividhini tatha. (Ch. 10.99).⁶⁴ Taking of snuffs and the use of purgatives are recognised modes for the treatment of vayu. Caraka in Sūtra-sthanam. 20. 11, writes स्नेहंस्वेदास्थपनानुवासनस्तः कर्मभोजनाभ्यंगोत्सादन परिपेकादिभिर्वातिहरैर्मात्रां कालञ्च प्रमाणीकृत्य । (65)

Bharata seems to be writing out the prescription for the treatment of a patient affected with wind, much as Caraka does in the above passage. Nasya and Vasti are recognised methods for the treatment of Vayu, and Bharata clearly takes these over from the speculations of Ayurveda.

Bharata once again prescribes a drink of barley (jabagu) for one, who is to be purgated. This fulfils Caraka's demand that a purgated man must first take in a little warm water, followed by a course of barley drink. Caraka in Sūtra-sthanam. 15, 15, writes, अथैनं सायाह्ने परे वाह्नि सुसोदकपरिपिक्तं पुराणानां लोहितशालितण्डुलानां स्ववक्रिन्नां मंडपूर्वा सुसोष्णां यवागूं पाथ्येदग्निं वलमभिसंमीक्ष्य चैवं द्वितीयेतृतीये चान्नकाले । चतुर्थेत्वन्नकाले तथाविधानामेव शालितण्डुलानामुत्स्विन्नां.....भोजयेत् ।..... दशमे त्वन्नकाले लावकपिजलादीनामन्यतमस्य मांसरसेनीदकलावणिकेनापि सारवता भोजयेत् । (66)

Caraka in the above passage also insists on taking well-boiled rice, along with the juice of mutton or other edible birds like lava or kapinjala. Bharata also prescribes exactly like Caraka that well-boiled rice is to be taken after a course of barley drink. Bharata writes in Ch. 10. 100,

स्निग्धान्यन्नाति च तथा रसकं मानकं तथा ।

आहाराधिष्ठिताः प्राणाः प्राणे योग्याः प्रतिष्ठिताः ॥ (67)

Abhinavagupta writes when commenting on this verse, रसकमिति मांसरसं सेवतेति संसृधः । पालकानि च स्निग्धनोति संसृधः ।

It appears that Abhinavagupta is aware of the implications of the concept of ahara in Bharata's speculations, and its background in Ayurveda.

There is nothing new in Bharata's discussion of vyayama, and food and drink, appropriate after a purgative treatment. Bharata follows even the little details, prescribed in the Ayurveda. Two relevant passages from Caraka might be cited ; and these would reveal the extent of Bharata's indebtedness to Indian medicine. Caraka speaks of the treatment of a patient, affected with wind.

केवलं निरुपष्टम्भमादौ स्नेहैरूपाचरेत् ।

वायुं सर्पिवसातैलमज्जापानैर्नरं ततः ॥

स्नेहकान्तं समाश्वास्य पयोभिः स्नेहयेत् पुनः ।

शूषैर्ग्राम्याम्बुजानूपरसैर्वा स्नेहसंयुतैः ॥

कृशरापायसैः साम्ललवणैः सानुवासनैः ।

नावणैस्तर्पणैश्चात्रैः सुस्निग्धं स्वेदयेत्तु तम् ॥

स्वभ्यक्तं स्नेहसंयुक्तौनाडीप्रस्तरसंकरैः ।

तथान्यै विविधैः स्वेदैर्यथायोगमुपाचरेत् ॥ (68)

(Cikitsa-sthanam 28.23)

Again,

दुर्वलोऽयं विरेच्यः स्यात् तं निरुहैरूपाचरेत् ।

पाचनैर्दीपनैर्यैर्वा भोजनैस्तद्व्युत्तैर्नरम् ॥

संशुद्धस्योध्यते चाग्नौ स्नेहस्वेदौ पुनर्हितौ ॥

साद्वस्त्रलवणस्निग्धैराहारैः सततं पुनः ।

नावणैर्धूमपानैश्च सर्वानिवोपपादयेत् ॥ (69)

(Cikitsa-sthanam 28.27)

Sweet and sour, salted and pleasant diet, along with snuff and smoking, are the best remedy for diseases of vayu. The emphasis on sweet dishes and mutton juices is typically Ayurvedic.

The great importance of vayu in Bharata's analysis seems to have proceeded from the consideration that it is vayu, which makes for the contact of indriyārtha with indriya. Caraka similarly holds in Sutra-sthanam. 1.26,

कालबुद्धीन्द्रियार्थानां यौगो मिथ्या ना चाति च ।

द्वयाश्रयानां व्याधीनां त्रिविधो हेतुसंज्ञको ॥ (70)

The three causes of both bodily and mental diseases, are kala, buddhi and indriya. These may arise out of ayoga, atiyoga or mithya yoga. These diseases might be either of body or of mind. Bharata also discusses ayoga, atiyoga and mithyayoga of indriya-indriyārtha with reference to mind. He confines himself to the unbalance produced in the mind by these three yogas of indriya-indriyārtha. The unbalance produced in the body by any of these three yogas of indriya-indriyārtha, is to be treated by the doctor and the medical practitioner.

In Sutra-sthanam, 15.16, Atreya says that ahara or food which restores the balance of bodily dhatus, and makes the unbalanced bodily dhatus return to normality, is of a beneficial nature. Ahara which even when properly administered disturbs the equilibrium of the body, and does not restore bodily balance, is ahita, or unsuitable. In Sutra-sthanam, 25.14, Atreya says once again that wholesome food contributes to the development of purusa, just as bad and unwholesome food is the cause of all diseases. Bharata in Ch. 22. 88-90 (G.O.S. vol. III) repeatedly says that indriyārtha in the form of sabda, rupa, sparsa, gandha and rasa must be wholesome or 'ista', so that the mind might become "saumukha". This is a distinct echo of Caraka's emphasis on the necessity of having proper and wholesome food.

The philosophic standpoint in which the same thing when taken in through the different senses appears as different, binds together the speculations of Alamkara and Ayurveda. The same thing, when acting in different roles, is known by different names. Caraka in Sutra-sthanam.

4.13. writes, एकोऽपि ह्यनेकां संज्ञां लभते कार्यान्तराणिकुवन् । तद्व्यथ पुरुषो वह्नां कर्मणां करणो समर्थो भवति । स द्रव्यत् कर्म करोति तस्य तस्य कर्मणः कर्तृकरणकार्यसंप्रयुक्तं तत्तद् गौणं नामविशेषं प्राप्नोति ।.....(71)

The same thing assumes different names, as it does different works. Cakrapani explain : एक पुरुषः कर्मणां व्यापाराणाम् उदन पचनकुम्भकरणस्नित्रकरणभूमिस्नाननानां करणो समर्थो भवति... .. द्रव्यत् कर्मेति उदनपाकादिग्रहः, द्रव्यत् कर्म करोति तस्य तस्य कर्मणः कर्तृसंप्रयुक्तं पाचक इति, करणसंप्रयुक्तं स्नानित्रक इति गुणयोगप्रवृत्तं गौणं; गुणयोगश्च-पाचक इत्यत्र पचिक्रियायां कर्तृत्वं, स्नानित्रक इत्यत्र स्नित्रकरणयुक्त स्नानं प्रति कर्तृत्वं, कुम्भकार इत्यत्र कार्यकुम्भोपहितं कर्तृत्वसित्येभिस्त्रिभिर्गुणैरभिन्नो भिन्नोऽप्यभिधीयते व्यवहियते इति भावः ।

The same man might be a cook, a potter, a blacksmith, or a digger of ground : their respective works are cooking, modelling of pots, fashioning of iron implements, or upturning the soil. The guna in the cook, is the knowledge of cooking, in the potter, the knowledge of clay-modelling, in the blacksmith the art of casting. Caraka in Sutra-sthanam, 26.26 describes how substance and quality always go together. A substance might sometimes become operative on account of its character as dravya, and at other moments, operative on account of its qualities. Caraka writes,

ननु केवलं गुणप्रभावादेव द्रव्याणि कर्म्मकानि स्युः । द्रव्याणि हि द्रव्यप्रभावाद् गुणप्रभावाद् द्रव्यगुणप्रभावाच्च तस्मिंस्तस्मिन् काले तच्चद्विधिकरणमासाद्य तां तांच युक्तिमर्थंच तं तममिप्रेत्य यत्कुर्वन्ति तत् कर्म येनकुर्वन्ति तद्वीर्यं....यच्च साधयन्ति तत् फलम् । (72)

Caraka in Sutra-sthanam, 26.37, writes gunas can never subsist in gunas ; and so the physician means by rasa only a particular quality of the thing, charged with rasa. This mutual dependence of dravya and guna is brought out even more clearly in Sutra-sthanam. 1.23, Caraka writes,

यत्राश्रिताः कर्मगुणाः कारणं समवायि यत् ।

तद्द्रव्यं समवायी तु निश्चेष्टः कारणं गुणः ॥ (73)

So substance and qualities can never be separated. All that takes place is this. Sometimes, substance predominates in

the effect produced ; sometimes it is the quality. But though there may be relative predominance of one in a particular state, there can never be a pure substance without any quality, or pure quality without a substantial basis. This impossibility of ever having pure substance or pure quality was to colour the later speculations of Saiva, Pratyabhijna, Sakta and Vaisnava systems.

It appears that the aswada of Sringara and Hasa is a guna-pradhana aswada, while the aswada of Madhura and Amla is a dravya-pradhana aswada. But substance and quality always go together. There is more point in Bharata's analogy of cooking in describing the evolution of Rasa than what is apparent on the surface. First, the concept of cooking, in so far as it means a change of state, is common to Ayurveda and Alamkara. It is ahara in both cases. Now the recipient sense-organ is the palate ; now it is the eye and the ear⁹. In both cases, through the gratification of the indriyas, the mind is pleased. What is important to remember in the present context is that Caraka's ahara is dravya-pradhana, while Bharata's ahara is guna-pradhana. But substance can never be without qualities. In spite of this relative predominance of dravya and guna in these two forms of ahara, the citta-sattva is equally gratified by both. This seems to be the philosophic background of how sense-impressions in the form of vibhavas are being changed into the bliss of aesthetic enjoyment.

VII

Once this philosophical position is accepted, it remains to be seen how subjective as well as objective difference make for divergent responses, even when the object or the subject may remain the same. Sense-knowledge or ahara is a relation between subject and object. A closer analysis of this relation would reveal that cognition which is knowledge of vibhava, might differ with the difference of the subject, when the object is the same ; or it might differ with the difference of the object, when the subject is un-

⁹ Dr. Beare's "Greek Theories of Elementary Cognition from Alcmaeon to Aristotle" (1906) may be profitably consulted.

changed. These subjective and objective differences account for the very great differences between different responses, which must finally decide the nature and quality of art-experience.

It is easy to see how emotion, which is a subjective reflection of an objective thing, is an ingredient of consciousness. Stimulating situations give rise to widespread ordered repercussions throughout the body, felt as clearly marked colourings of consciousness. A detailed analysis of these repercussions in the body and the mind will be made in Chapters VII on *sattvikabhava* and VIII on *vyabhi-charibhava*. The patterns in organic response assume the forms of fear, grief, joy and anger and other emotional states. They arise for the most part when permanent or periodical tendencies of the individual are suddenly either 'facilitated or frustrated. I. A. Richards thinks that these responses are far less dependent upon "the nature of the external stimulus than upon the general internal circumstances of the individuals' life at the time the stimulus occurs" (*Principles of Literary Criticism*, 1938, ch. XIII).

These emotional states, with pleasure and unpleasure, are customarily distinguished under the head of feeling from sensations, which are, as already noticed, very closely dependent for their character upon their stimulus. Thus sensations are ranked together as cognitive elements, concerned, that is, with the knowledge of things, rather than with the attitude or behaviour towards them, or our emotion about them. Pleasure, however, and emotion have also a cognitive aspect.

Two main features characterise every emotional experience. One of these is a diffused reaction in the organs of the body brought about through the sympathetic systems. The other is a tendency to action of some definite kind or group of kinds. These extensive changes in the visceral and vascular systems, characteristically in respiration and in glandular secretion, commonly take place in response to stimulus which call some instinctive tendency into play. As a result of all these changes, a tide of sensations of internal bodily origin comes into consciousness. It is generally agreed that these sensations make up at least the main part of the peculiar consciousness of an emotion.

These sensations or images of them are then a main ingredient of an emotional experience, and account for its peculiar "colour" or tone, for the voluminousness and massiveness, as well as for the extreme acuteness of emotions. But of equal importance are the changes in consciousness due to reactions in the nervous systems which control movement, governing muscular response to the stimulating situation.

I. A. Richards minimises the importance of the external stimulus, and emphasizes the general internal circumstances of the individual's life. The Indian analysis recognises the equal importance of both the external stimulus, and the general internal set-up of the individual's life. This last has played a very important part in Rasa-analysis; it assumes the form of *vasana*. Rasa-enjoyment is impossible for one who is without *vasana*. The difference in external stimulus may give rise to the *bheda* of *alambana* or *asraya*. The difference in the subjective world may give rise to divergent appreciations of the same thing by different men, with subjective differences.

In the objective difference, it is the *ahara* or the thing appealing to sense, which changes. A man may love a host of things. There cannot be, it seems, any limit to what a man likes or dislikes. With a great lover like Rupert Brooke, it might be,

White plates and cups, clean gleaming,
Ringed with blue lines, and feathery, faery dust;
Wet roofs beneath the lamp-light; the strong crust
of friendly bread; and many-tasting food;
Rainbows, and the blue bitter smoke of wood.

(The Great Lover).

It is needless to refer to Kalidasa's *ramyani beeksya madhuran-sa nlsamya*, both of which are forms of *ahara*; or to Keat's sensuousness, where all five senses are gratified.

The reason why a particular man may be in love with many things is that he has a soul which has many facets, eager to take in different kinds of experience. Keats spoke of this many-faceted soul of the poet, when he wrote, "The poet is the most unpoetic creature in the world" (Letter to Woodhouse. 27.10.1818.). The poet is unpoetic in the sense that he has not a fixed, circumscribed personality.

The appreciator of a work of art or of any form of sense-knowledge, looks forward to Sattvic, Rajas or Tamas' ahara, as he is of a Sattvic, Rajas or Tamas nature. If the Sattvic purusa takes in Sattvic ahara, this ahara by first gratifying the senses, satisfies his eitta-sattva. The Ayurveda speaks of satmya-ahara, or ahara which is congenial to body and soul. The body and the eitta-sattva are equally gratified by this taking in of congenial Rasa. If on the other hand, one constantly feeds on uncongenial Rasa, there is a depletion, instead of gratification and replenishment. Caraka repeats this standpoint in Sutra-sthanam. 1. 18, where he writes sarvada sarva-bhavanam samanyam vridhhi-karanam. Vacaspati Misra in Samkhya-tattva-kaumudi refers to the case of Padmavati in support of this standpoint, that how it is a particular man may love one object, while another may not be in love with it. This can only be explained if it be remembered that the mental constituents of these different men are also different. This subjective difference is explained if the varying mental constituents of these different men be taken into consideration. This applies to sattvic purusa, as also to Rajasa and Tamasa purusas. At the moment of the inception of the purusa, the balance and equilibrium of the three gunas is disturbed by adrsta, resulting in the evolution of very different purusas. This difference in the constituents of different purusas, is very difficult to be removed. For instance, it is almost an impossibility to make a man who is born deaf or blind, hear or see again. Such derangement in the nature of the purusa is made possible by the parents transmitting the latent cause, or his being born in such a place or time, which will predetermine his mental and physical constitution. Even social conditions might very largely influence the nature and destiny of man. There can hardly be any exception to such a general rule. A man is endowed with a particular prakriti by the inexorable law of causality at the moment of his birth, and also by his own adrsta. The whole range of activities of a man, his varied and diverse response, and the very nature of man—all these are preconditioned by his prakriti. This prakriti determines what sthayi-bhavas are dominant in a particular man. Prakriti as has been just noticed, is linked up with the laws of causality as well as his own adrsta. This varied and diverse response of a particular man, when he is confronted with different things,

is only to be explained from the analysis of the different constituents of his mental make-up.

The problem of vibhava or ahara might be looked at from another standpoint. It is very often found that while one particular object has a very wide range of appeal, another object used by a different poet may have a very limited range. How the wide popularity of one particular vibhava, and the comparatively lukewarm appeal of another, are to be explained? It seems that the vibhava, which has a very wide range of appeal, must have entered into mass-consciousness. A good deal of obscurity of the literature of a by-gone age, is to be explained by that there have been a loss of continuity and a break of tradition. A poet cannot successfully use new data for metaphor or simile until they have become familiar to ordinary people. Many of the abstract terms used by the poet today, have no overtones. It is as if a painter suddenly stuck on his canvas a piece of actual material, cabbage leaf, corduray, whatever it might be, instead of painting it. The patch, the abstract word snatched from contemporary life, has not been assimilated, and fairly well digested in the popular imagination. Poetry must have a common universal background between the poet and the audience; and this applies to all cases of aesthetic appreciation. There is no common ground of belief today upon which a poet may take his stand or against which he may re-act, to correspond with the Christian tradition in the Middle Ages, or the Renaissance humanist tradition of the seventeenth century Europe, or the efflorescence which characterises the ages of Kalidasa and Bhavabhuti. When poets have no such common ground with their readers, no set of beliefs, which both take for granted, some of the traditional channels of communication are automatically closed. This applies not only between two periods in one particular country, but also between two particular countries at one particular moment of time. A particular form, or colour or shape is beautiful, if it has been endowed with qualities which satisfy the ordinary man, and has entered into mass-consciousness. Why a particular form is beautiful is to be explained with reference to social and cultural conditions, to religious beliefs, and sometimes, even political faith. All these enter into mass-consciousness.

In discussing vibhavas, it is good to remember that poetry contains manifest and latent contents. The manifest

content can be roughly arrived at by paraphrasing the poem. But the latent content, i.e., the emotional content has almost entirely vanished in such a paraphrase. It was contained then, not in the external reality (symbolised by the words for this has been preserved), but by the words themselves. The manifest content in the poetry is interpreted "rationally". It is the external reality in the poem. It can be expressed in other ways and other languages. But the latent content of poetry is in that particular form of wording, and in no other.

How is the latent content contained in the original word and not contained in the sense of the words—i.e., in the portions of external reality which the words symbolise? This external reality which is the vibhava of the poem, has a manifest and latent content. This manifest content is apparent even to a casual reader. But it requires a high degree of intellectual and aesthetic discipline to get the most of this latent content. Even then this content is not completely exhausted. The emotions are associated affectively with the portion of external reality, symbolised by the manifest content, for another language can be made to symbolise the same portion of external reality, and still it is not the poem. How then did the original words in the poem contain the emotional content "in themselves" and not in the things they symbolised? It is by the "affective association" of ideas.

If a word be abstracted from its surroundings and concentrated on, a number of associations will rise vague to the mind. In a simple word like "spring", there are hundreds of them; of greenness, of youth, of fountains, of jumping; every word drags behind it a vast bag and baggage of emotional associations, picked up in the thousands of different circumstances in which the word was used. It is these associations that provided the latent content of affect which is the poem. Not the ideas of "greenness" and "youth", but the affective cord linking the ideas of "greenness" and "youth" to the word "spring" constitutes the raw material of poetry. Vibhavas which might assume any shape in the world of sense, are all held by these associations and affective cords. It shows how deeply the vibhavas must be immersed in the mass-consciousness, before there can be any association and affectiveness.

This would indicate that a particular form is beautiful,

not so much for its intrinsic beauty, or even because of a certain arrangement of the different parts of it, satisfying our aesthetic sense, but because it fits in well with the social and cultural ideals of the people and of the country. Dark eyes are a mark of beauty among the Indians, while blue eyes characterise beautiful women in the West. Dark hair among the Indians, is beautiful, while golden auburn is the characteristic mark of a beautiful lady in Europe. These concepts go to the roots of the mass mind. It appears that darkness which protects us from the glare of the tropical sun, has been associated with the ideas of gentleness and kindness, while in Europe with its freezing skies, love and affection are always warm.

These particular emotional attitudes are very often associated with one particular word or with one particular thing. It is usual to look at words and things as completely divorced and severed from all such associations, and take these at their face value. But take away the associations, which are deeply rooted in the social consciousness of the mass-mind, the colour and the glow of the word will all disappear. A word is charged with an aura of meaning, the sources of which are to be traced in the deep consciousness of the country and of the people.

It is clear how one particular emotion, arising out of a particular vibhava, may travel much beyond the immediate significance of the words, or forms symbolising it. There is another aspect of the problem. It is how one particular sentiment has to depend necessarily on certain customary and usual excitants. The basis of this relation appears again to be the law of association. In poetry, words are born or re-born in the act of thinking. Does it follow that poetry is solely an affair of words? The answer seems to be yes; an affair of words adequate to the thought involved. An affair of one word, like Shakespeare's "incarnadine", or of two or three words like "shady sadness", "incense-breathing Morn", or of all the words necessary for a thought like the Divine Comedy.

Vibhavas might again be looked upon either as stationary or as evolving. Vibhavas which have no aura of meaning about them, dull and prosaic as these are, are stationary. It seems likely that most poetry with evolving vibhavas, is markedly imaginative, and will naturally be read as though its meanings were inherent in the words.

Some of the poetry with stationary vibhavas, will best be read otherwise—with a clear and recognised distinction between the words and the meanings attributed to them. But the finest poetry must necessarily use this evolving vibhava, where excitants are indissolubly connected with one particular sentiment. The stationary vibhava is the world of motor-buses, beef-steaks and acquaintances, the framework of things and events within which we maintain our every-day existence, the world of the routine satisfaction of our minimum exigencies. But in the world of evolving vibhavas, every word of the routine world is invested with other values than those necessary for our bare continuance as living beings: all objects for which we can feel love, awe, admiration; any quality beyond the account of physics, chemistry and the physiology of sense-perception, nutrition, reproduction and locomotion.

It seems that while alambana vibhava is stationary, uddipana vibhavas are evolving, emergent. Alambana vibhava is the peg from which the superstructure of the artistic form is hung. The many associations and suggestions with which a particular form is invested, assume the form of uddipana vibhava. These uddipana vibhavas by their very nature, are associated with an object, which itself might be stationary. In this emergent evolution, the object will gather around it different symbols, which feed and sustain the original vibhava, so much so that certain ideas will come to be identified with it. For instance, the mention of Radha will bring in its train a host of uddipana vibhavas, like black clouds, black waters and dark forest trees. The basis of this relation is provided no doubt by Krisna and all these natural things, sharing in the concept of blackness. What is to be noted in the analysis of emergent vibhava is this. The colour blackness, the universal content in all these different manifestations, itself changes. Lord Krisna, black clouds, curling waters and dark trees are all vibrant with this one trait. In spite of their very real difference, they have coalesced and merged into one in the mind of all lovers. But in stationary or alambana vibhava, the difference between the entities are uppermost, and cannot be ruled out. So alambana vibhava must first be made dynamic with the imposition of uddipana vibhava. It has already been noticed how important is this concept of movement in Bharata's Rasa-analysis, for vibhava which

transmits and one who receives. This third requirement is fulfilled by the presence of a common cultural and social background, a homogeneous platform on which the transmitter and the receiver may meet.

The stabilisation which arises out of bhava or ahara is of the nature of samprajnata samadhi. It should be noted that the Yoga-sutra speaks of the four-fold divisions of samprajnata samadhi (Samadhi-pada 17). The intense absorption in one particular object, or motivation in one direction is known as Yoga or Samadhi. When the citta becomes completely dissociated from everything else, or when the vrittis are all controlled, it is once again Yoga or samadhi. In the initial stages of this second form of samadhi, there is awareness of the contemplated thing. Gradually, this awareness goes out, leaving the citta without any vritti or alambana. At this moment, the citta rests on its own self. From this standpoint, it appears that samadhi is two-fold. In Samprajnata Samadhi, there is an awareness of the meditated object or alambana. There is no kind of awareness whatsoever in a samprajnata samadhi.

Vacaspati Misra explains how the Yogin shall have to concentrate first on the tangible salagrama, or any imaginal form of a god, or any other existent thing, and turn the stream of thought on it, just as the archer practises by learning how to shoot first at a tangible form, and then at a less tangible form, and lastly, at a point. In all meditations, the stream of thought is turned away more and more from real tangible forms and shapes to subtler and more refined forms. So it appears that the contemplated or meditated object may be of two forms: tangible or gross, and intangible or subtle. Vacaspati writes, *evam cittasyalambane suksma abhoga sthulakaranabhutasuksmapankatanmatralingalinga visaya vicara*.⁷⁴ It seems from the use of both sthula and suksma, that everything in this world can be the objects of their contemplation. But still, there are points of difference. There might be bahya-sthula and bahya-suksma, as also adhyatmika-sthula and adhyatmika-suksma. The bahya-sthula is again divisible into five constituents—kshiti, apa, tejas, marut and vyoma. The indriyas are known as adhyatmika-sthula. The constituents of bahya-sthula are the tanmatra or paramanu; these are known as bahya-suksma. The constituents of adhyatmika sthula are aham-tattva, and buddhi-tattva. These are known as adhyatmika suksma.

There are two other objects of contemplation apart from these ; these are atma and Iswara. There are different results if one turns one's stream of thought on these different objects of contemplation. If there be "abhoga" or prajna of bahya-sthula at the very beginning of samadhi, then it is known as "vltarka". If there be this prajna of bahya-suksma, then it is "vicara". If some "adhyatmika-sthula" be the object of samadhi, and there be prajna born out of dhyana, then it is known as 'ananda'. If there be this abhoga or prajna of the caitanya, endowed with buddhi, then it is known as "asmita". Samprajnata Yoga or Samadhi is thus divisible into these four parts, each successive stage showing a further refinement than the one which goes before. These are known as "sa-vltarka", "sa-vicara", "sa-ananda" and "sa-asmita".

There is a different type of samprajnata yoga ; it is concentration on God. Nothing remains to be done at such a moment. The worshipper is fully satisfied ; and he is able to live through eternlty. If one turns the stream of thought to any of these four objects of contemplation, there is gradually an identification with the object of contemplation. The citta attains Sarupya with the object of contemplation, as contemplation gradually becomes steadfast. At such a moment, the contemplative self-absorbed citta is unmoved. No other vritti or jnana could be present in the mind. It is not only true for the present. If there be the tendency to manifestation of any of these, these cannot disturb the calm contemplativeness of vritti, which has reached the objectification of thought. When there is nothing to resist this steadfastness of citta, then it is samprajnata samadhi.

When there is intense apprehension of samprajnata samadhi, the citta becomes detached from the object of thought. At this moment, the citta easily attains a state which is without any alambana. Such niralambana samadhi is known as a samprajnata samadhi. There cannot be any mano-vritti at this stage. The citta in niralambana samadhi is like that of one who is fast asleep, or is on the brink of extinction, or laya. Such a stage is to be arrived at by long and continuous practice. This kind of niralambana samadhi is only to be achieved by severest penance and renunciation. The Yogi who is not satisfied with samprajnata samadhi, looks after asamprajnata samadhi. In asamprajnata samadhi, there is universal discontent ; no vritti is allowed to stay in the citta. Even samprajnata vritti is ruled out. Such stead-

fastness naturally leads to such a condition, when the citta comes to be without any support. The citta grows averse to receiving any object. Gradually it gets to the limits of laya.

In art-experience, the Samadhi is necessarily of the samprajnata nature. The alambana is prominent in Rasa-enjoyment. To rule out the alambana vibhava as in asamprajnata samadhi, would be to rule out the very basis of Rasa-enjoyment. These vibhavas are gathered or 'ahrita' through the functioning of the different vrittis of the citta. But in asamprajnata samadhi, the functioning of vrittis is firmly checked. The artist aims to arrive at such a kind of balance, through the mediation of alambana or objects of contemplation. The nature of this balance is to be discussed in fuller details in Ch. IX.

The problem of vibhava has been discussed at length, because it is the starting point in Bharata's Rasa-sutra. The question has been looked at from the broader philosophical standpoint. Narrow specialisation is very often likely to ignore the philosophical affiliations of the problem. What is Vibhava in Bharata is ahara in Caraka-Patanjala, and Arammana in Abhidhamma system. It is expected that the whole position of Indian Rasa-speculations, will have to be reassessed when the question is looked at from this standpoint.

CHAPTER III

CONCEPT OF ŚAMANYA RASA IN ALAMKARA AND AYURVEDA

The problem of the relation between body and mind has occupied philosophers and scientists since the dawn of thought, and to many it appears no nearer to solution now than then. It has been named the central problem of all philosophy, fundamental alike in the theory of knowledge, in ethics and in religion. Not less fundamental, however, is it for psychology and for physical science; for the point of view from which one regards mental development, the changing forms of nature, human life and evolution, will be radically different as one does, or does not attribute to mind a controlling or directing part in the process of change and growth. The question of the relation between body and mind cannot be discussed apart from the question as to the nature of the two factors, and the difference between them. Both are really metaphysical questions; that is to say, the solution put forward will necessarily be incapable of scientific verification.

A summary review of the positions taken by some typical thinkers will serve to introduce the modern aspect of the problem. The problem of the relation of body to mind is of fundamental importance to a large group of sciences. "Since the dawn of modern philosophy in the *Meditations of Descartes*, the question of the relation between body and mind has been continuously under discussion"¹. But the problem dates back earlier still. It has deeply coloured the aesthetic speculations of the ancient Greeks.²

Whether one deals with the special relation between the individual mind and the individual body, or with the general relation of finite mind to matter, there are three possible solutions for the problem: (1) That matter or body is the "real" or "substantial" thing, while mind is its product,

¹ Naturalism and Agnosticism, II. 4—Ward

² Jacob Bernays, the great Aristotelian scholar of the 19th century, offers a pathological interpretation of the aesthetic doctrine of *Katharsis* in Aristotle's *Poetics*. (vide *Zwei Abhandlungen*, Berlin, 1880) For a criticism of Bernays' view, see *Re-examination of the Doctrine of Katharsis*—Sen (Viswabharati Quarterly, 1959-60).

or in some way dependent upon it both for its existence and for its qualities—the solution of Materialism. The materialist solution of the problem is faced with certain serious objections. What is fatal to any such reduction of mind to a secondary place is the first principle of Epistemology, viz., that matter or body is given only as idea or content of consciousness; it cannot be the source of that, which is a presupposition of its own existence. It is an actual inversion of the true order of things, therefore to place matter first and mind second. The second difficulty the view has to face is that of the incomparability of mind and matter: they contain no common characteristic, except that of change in time: In other respects, as the Cartesians*³ pointed out, every attribute of mind may be derived of body, and vice versa. Thus matter occupies space, has form, resistance etc., while mind is wholly non-spatial in itself, has neither place nor any other spatial determination. Any attempt to reduce mind to matter, or to a mere effect of matter is self-contradictory. (2) That mind alone is real, or substantial, and that matter or body is its appearance, its manifestation, or in some other way dependent upon it for existence and quality—this is the solution of Idealism or Spiritualism.*⁴ (3) The third standpoint recognises mind and matter as equally real and independent entities; or equally unreal, as the two “aspects”, “appearances”, “sides” of one and the same reality. The former is Dualism, the latter “Scientific Monism”, or the Philosophy of Identity. There are of course, many shades of difference and many overlappings in the different views that have actually been held. The relation between finite mind and finite body may be either (a) that of complete dependence, as when the mind is regarded as the “secretion of the brain”, or as an “epiphenomenon”, a by-product of physical process; (b) that of parallelism*⁵, the two series mental and bodily, corresponding step for step, element for element with each other, but never acting upon each other; or (c) that of reciprocity or inter-action, mental processes being the condition of bodily, bodily of mental processes. The last is the “natural”

* See Introduction p. iv-vi.

⁴ See Introduction p. II III. Jacob Boehme, among others, is the exponent of this standpoint.

⁵ Among the exponents of Parallelism, Fechner, Spencer, Haeckel, Höffding and Paulsen may named.

standpoint. We regard ourselves as causing bodily movements by our will, and as receiving sensations and perceptions from physical objects which act upon our bodily organs. It is also the standpoint of Dualism on the one hand, and of several forms of spiritualism or Idealism on the other.

The Indian approach to the problem of the relation between body and mind is more philosophically conceived than the solution, offered by the Materialists, or by those advocating Parallelism. The solution offered by the Idealists or the Spiritualists, again, does not give a complete answer to the question. Before discussing the two sister speculations of *Alamkara* and *Ayurveda*, which run parallel (the word is used with some diffidence, for it is much more than a case of parallelism) to each other, it is necessary to analyse the common basis, which holds these two speculations together.

The discussion of how *sarira* and *manasa Rasas* are equally dependent on *ahara* in Ch. II, should have pointed out that there must be a logical starting point, a universal basis of these two sister speculations in *Alamkara* and *Ayurveda*. It is easily conceivable that there cannot be any similarity between two entirely disparate things. The fact that there is a good deal of similarity between these two kindred speculations points out that there is something common in between these two. In Ch. II, it has already been noticed that the *Rasa* speculations of *Alamkara* and *Ayurveda*, being both based on *ahara*, necessarily run parallel to each other. It is necessary to examine the universality or *samanyata* of these two concepts, if any serious attempt is to be made for a proper understanding of the dependence of one speculation on the other. An analysis of this *samanyata* of *sarira* and *manasa Rasas* should indicate that the large scale borrowings by *Alamkara* from *Ayurveda* were no freak, but were made necessary and even imperative by the inwardness of the problem. This analysis of the unifying basis of these two kindred speculations has not been attempted by any one, writing on the history of *Rasa* literature.

A thing which is being always interpenetrated by a particular constituent or a thing which could never be without thus being penetrated by such a constituent, is known as the *vastu*, made up of this *upadana*. The teachers of

Samkhya, Patanjala, and the Vaiakaranas, Kalakaranikas and the Brahma-vadins are all agreed about the validity of this position. The Samkhya system puts forth the arguments for the validity of this proposition. The Samkhya teachers refer among many others to the hetu, "Samanvayat" for the establishment of the existence of Prakriti. Vacaspati Misra in Bhamati, offers an explanation of this hetu, on which depends the logical basis of this doctrine, Samanvayat. "Jani ca jena rupena a ca sthauhyat a ca sauksmayat samaniyante tani tadatmaka-samanya-purvakanl loke drstanl. Jatha mrdatmaka-samanyataya samanvita ghatadayo vikara mrt-samanyopadanoka loke prasiddha. Vacaspati means by this that all karya-vastu in a substantial or in a refined form, or in any other form is always being penetrated by something underlying them. This is their samanya-rupa. A thing being inseparable from this universal content, is thus known to be the product of this constituent. A thing becomes absolutely unintelligible, when it is without this substantial nature or basis. This universal content which always underlies all manifestations is known as the upadana of this vastu. The universal content of all particular manifestations, without which content a thing can never be, is its constituent. There can never be an upadeya without this upadana, or a thing without this constitutive basis. It is because of this that the Samkhya looks upon that something which underlies all different manifestations, and can be traced in all such expressions, as the universal content or upadana of it. The Samkhya looks at samanya as upadana, and visesa as upadeya. Pots and jars are the particular manifestations of the universal earth. So these particular manifestations as pots and jars are Karya, but the universalised nature of earth which underlies all these particular manifestations, is their upadana. This universalised nature of earth underlies all such particular manifestations. There can never be a particular form, completely divorced from this substantial basis.

What is the nature of this universalised earth which underlies all particular manifestations as earthen pots and jars? The Samkhya doctrine believes in Sat-karya-vada. It holds that asat can never come into being, just as sat can never pass away. So according to this view, appearance and disappearance of particular forms out of this unmanifest state, are to be taken as creation and destruction. All

possible particular manifestations of earth are comprehended in this universalised nature of earth. The Samkhya doctrine speaks of *karya* as *dharma*, and *upadana* or constituent as *dharmi*. So it appears that the universalised nature of earth is *dharmi*, while pots and sherds are particular manifestations, and as such, *dharma*. All these *dharma*s, and these are of a diverse and varied nature, are stationed in this generalised concept of earth. All such *dharma*s can be classified into three groups. These are known as *santa*, *udita* and *avyapadesya*. All *dharma*s of a particular body are to be traced to any of these three forms. When the lump of earth is in "pinda" form, then this state is called the manifest or *udita* form of *pinda*. When the *pinda* is in the manifest state, then the pot is in an *avyapadesya* form, lying concealed in the *pinda* nature of earth. But when with the passing away of the *pinda* stage, there is the manifestation of the pot, it is usual to speak of the *pinda*-stage as *santa*, and of the *ghata*-stage as *udita*. Again, with the passing away of *ghata*, there is the appearance of the pot-sherds. At such a moment, it is usual to speak of the *ghata*-stage as *santa*, and pot-sherds as *udita*. These pot-sherds were present in an unmanifest or *avyapadesya* form in the *ghata*. So all future states are known as *avyapadesya*, the present stage is known as *udita*; and all past forms are characterised as *santa*. All particular manifestations will be comprehended in one of these three states; but the universalised nature of earth underlies them all. It has already been pointed out how *dharma* can never be without this *dharmi*. The *Santa* stage is sometimes spoken of as *astamita*, or past and no longer existent. A *vastu* disappears into that from which it springs. So to speak of the universalised nature of earth would be to speak of a state of earth, where all particular manifestations of it, have already set and disappeared. When all these diverse manifestations have entered into that one state, which can comprehend all, then it is usual to speak of that state as the universalised nature of it. This universal content in all these diverse manifestations of earth, is known as the *samanya* earth. This universal content of earth is the constituent of all such particular manifestations. The universal content of earth, underlying all particular manifestations is thus known as *upadana*. The Samkhya looks upon *samanya* as *upadana* or constituent; and *visesa* as *upadeya* or mani-

fest product. Though universalised earth underlies all particular manifestations as jar and pot, it does not underlie particular manifestations of water or of fire. The constituents of particular manifestations of water or of fire are the universalised nature of water or of fire.

The question naturally arises if there is really something, which can be called the universal content of earth. A thing which can become an object of knowledge, is said to have an existential nature. The existence of a thing which cannot become the object of knowledge, can neither be affirmed nor denied. Nothing can be said about something, which totally eludes all means of knowledge. The earth which is visible, is always impressed with particular shapes and forms. The earth which is without any impression whatsoever, cannot be the subject of prapatti or knowledge. But the universal nature of earth which can never be the subject of knowledge, is hardly comprehensible. So it seems fair to say that if the universal nature of earth, which is without the impressions of particular manifestations, cannot be the subject of knowledge, then there is no such thing as universalised earth, completely divorced from these particular manifestations. But if the validity of the proposition of the universalised nature of earth be not established, then the very basis of Samkhya system would be uprooted. The validity of Prakriti in Samkhya speculations rests on the establishment of this samanya or universalised concept of things. If on the other hand, the Samanya concept could not be established the validity of Prakriti itself would be questioned. This means that there is an end to all processes in Samkhya evolution and involution. The Patanjala Yogasutra (3.14) speaks of santa-udita-avyapadesya-dharmanupati-dharmi.⁷⁵ There can never be, according to this sutra, two udita states (dharma) in one common substrate (dharmi). If there be one udita state in a particular substrate, then the other states or dharma must either be of a santa or of an avyapadesya nature. So if the earth has assumed the form of a pot, there must be before it earth in the form of "pinda". If the pinda form be in the udita state, then the pot cannot appear or become udita in it. One udita or manifest state is always at war with another udita state. So if the pinda state becomes santa, then the ghata-state becomes udita. It is not possible to say that an udita state

becomes *santa* even before the appearance of another conflicting *udita* state. To say that this is possible would be saying that two opposing stages can exist together in the same common substrate. But two opposing *udita* stages can not exist simultaneously in this *upadana* or substrate. The logic of the argument naturally leads to the conclusion that the *pinda*-state must cease to be, before the advent of the *ghata*-state. At the moment of the disappearance of the *pinda*-state, no other *udita* state is conceivable in the earth. If such a second state be said to exist in the earth, then the argument is vitiated by the above fallacy. The earth also is charged with opposite states ; and there cannot be the appearance of the *ghata*-state. The logic of the argument demands that after the disappearance of the *pinda*-state and before the advent of the *ghata*-state, there is a moment when the earth has got to be without any quality whatsoever. This formless state of the earth is known as the universalised content of it, or the *mrit-samanya*. This is the constituent of all particular manifestations of earth, as jars and pots.

No particular manifestation of earth can be the constituent of any other particular manifestation ; because particulars are always opposed to one another. So it naturally follows that the *samanya* is the constituent of *visesa*. The *samanya*-state is in accord with all particular manifestations or *visesas*. The *samanya*-state underlies all particular manifestations, and as such, is in keeping with different manifestations or *visesas*. The universal *mrit*, which is without any impression is thus the constituent of all different forms of *mrit*, in the shapes of jars and pots. To say that the universal *mrit* exists is to say this much that there is no jar and pot in it. But still there are in this universal *mrit*, *rupa*, *sparsa* and *gandha*. Even when *rupa*, *rasa*, *sparsa* and *gandha* exist in the earth, these are without any particular form or shape, so much so that the earth itself has almost disappeared. The degree of subsidence of particular forms in the universal basis of *mrit*, has been carried so far, and the earth itself has become so refined as to be almost on the verge of extinction, that the Buddhist philosophers have been led to believe that there cannot be such a stage, when the earth itself is without any form whatsoever. So after the disappearance of the *pinda*-stage, and before the advent of the *ghata*-stage, there is no earth at all. So jars and pots spring out of nothingness or *abhava*. The Buddhists hold that all

existent things thus come into being out of nothingness. But the Samkhya teachers hold that existent things can never come into being out of nothingness : *nasatovidyate bhava, nabhavo vidyate sata* (Bhagavad-Gita. II. 16). All existent things and *visesas* on the other hand, come out of *samanya*. The proof that *samanya* is the constituent of *visesa*, is to be found only in direct intuitional knowledge. The earth which is in the form of *pinda*, is the same which persists and enters into the making of *ghata*. Every one has a kind of intuitive apprehension that this earth is the same—*saivacam mrit*. The earth which appears in this intuitive apprehension (*pratyabhijnamana*) is the universalised general concept of *mrit*, or *mrit samanya*. It should be noted that no particular state or *vises* *avastha* can ever become the subject of intuitive apprehension. This generalised concept of earth is implicit in all particular manifestations of it. Though it is possible to apprehend the circumscribed nature of earth in a *visesa* form, the uncircumscribed character of *samanya* earth is beyond the reach of all apprehensions. The generalised character of *samanya* earth is far more extensive and wide-ranging than a *visesa* or particular manifestation of it. With the establishment of this extensive character of *mrit-samanya*, one is logically led to its incomprehensibility. The existent thing or *upadeya* in Samkhya analysis is thus of a more circumscribed character than the *upadana*. This *upadana* is more extensive and far more subtle than the *upadeya*. The general rule governing the relationship between *upadana* and *upadeya* is this. The *upadeya* or the product is always more limited and circumscribed, and of a smaller extension than its constituent or *upadeya*. If the analysis be pressed further, it will appear that even *mrit-samanya* or the generalised character of earth is the *upadeya* or the product of the constituent of *gandha-tanmatra*. This *gandha tanmatra* is far more extensive and wide-ranging, and as such, more subtle and incomprehensible than *mrit-samanya*. So also *gandha-tanmatra* becomes the *upadeya* or the product, its constituent or *upadana* being *bhutatadi ahamkara* or *tamasa ahamkara*. So also *tamasa ahamkara* is the *upadeya*, its *upadana* being *avyakta* or *pradhana*. This logical sequence from *upadeya* to *upadana* would reveal that *upadana* is infinitely more extensive and subtle than *upadeya*, and is closer to the *samanya* concept. This expansion and extension, this width of range and universalised character of

appearance, along with subtlety of comprehension have reached their acme at a particular stage.

This is the primary beginning of all creations. This is samanya par excellencce. This is so subtle as to be beyond all comprehensions. This width of range and expansion and extension, this samanya character of the thing become more and more comprehensive, as one travels from one upadana to another. The state beyond which there can be no further stage, the extension which does not admit of further extension, the samanya character beyond which there is none and incomprehensibility which has reached its limits, all these have ultimately come to rest at a particular point. This resting-point according to the logic of Samkhya analysis, is in Prakriti, the universal constituent of everything else. This Prakriti is by far the most extensive; this underlies everything else. This is the mrit-samanya; this is the finest of them all. This is the stage where the breaking up of upadeya into upadana must necessarily stop. But according to the Vaicesika analysis, upadana is more limited in extension than the upadeya. The Vaicesika analysis holds that as one travels from one upadana to another, one arrives at the minutest fragment, the atomic nature of things. The analysis in Vaicesika system must stop with the smallest, the minutest, the atomic-character of the constituent. So the Samkhya and Vaicesika analyses travel in two opposite directions. The Samkhya holds that the universal constituent of everything is all-embracing prakriti; it is the most comprehensive. But according to the Vaicesikas, the constituents which enter into the making of everything, are the atoms, the smallest and the most subtle of all. There are further points of distinction. The Samkhya holds that the upadana is more subtle and less comprehensible, which the Vaicesikas deny. The Vaicesikas are of opinion that upadana and upadeya sharing in the same characters and qualities, are equally manifest, equally visible. The invisibility of paramanu and dvanuka is to be accounted for by their extremely small dimensions. But these have in them all the qualities, present in the manifest form. So the earth-atoms have all the qualities, which are to be met in the earth; so it is the case with water-atoms and water. In this way, the Vaicesika system is just the opposite of the Samkhya scheme. The rigour of logic in Samkhya system points to universal prakriti. This last is to be arrived

at as one travels from one upadana to another. But in Vaicesika scheme, the resting place is in the atom itself. Though there is this clear distinction between Samkhya and Vaicesika analyses, it has escaped the attention of some writers on Samkhya system. Vijnana-bhikshu has tried to identify the two very distinct standpoints of Samkhya and Vaicesika, and sung paens of praise of Samkhya analysis, even when he has been discussing Vaicesika system.

It has already been noted that the upadana of mrit-samanya is gandha-tanmatra. The five tan-matras are the upadana of the five mahabhootas. The question of gandha-tanmatra might be discussed at length. The Yukti-dipika in explaining the thirty-eight Karika (p. 140) writes ;—*Katham punastanmatra-nityuchyate. Tuiya-jatliya-visesan-upapattes, evam sparsa-tanmatre-mrdu-kathinadayo. Evam rupa-tanmatre sukla-krisnadayo, evam rasa-tanmatre madhura-miadayo, evam gandha-tanmatre surabhyadayo. Tasmāt tasya tasya gunasya samanyam evatra na visesa iti tanmatrasvete avisesa.*⁷⁶ The Yukti-dipika says that tanmatra arises out of non-cognition (anupapatti) of visesas of a similar nature. In gandha-matra, there is the universal character of gandhattva. But at the moment of taking in a particular gandha, it is usual to take in with it, also its fragrance or the lack of it, and all different degrees of gentle, pungent and refreshing qualities associated with it. So the different degrees of fragrance are all rooted in the universal nature of gandhattva. It has already been noted that samanya is the constituent, while visesa is the product of it. When all different manifestations or characters of gandha are latent in the generalised nature of gandha, then this universal state comprehending all different states of gandha, is gandha-tanmatra. There is here nothing but gandhattva. The generalised nature of gandha, in which all different manifestations of gandha have disappeared, cannot be the subject of sensuous cognition. It being extremely refined, cannot be the subject of sensuous apprehension. It is usual to take in gandha, charged with a particular character or form. The incapacity of ordinary human senses, stands in the way of apprehending the universal nature of gandha. This applies also to the inability of appreciating the tanmatras of other indriyarthas. At the moment of appreciating a visual form, the form is always invested with red and blue and yellow colours. The form is apprehended

as a red or a blue form. But take away these colours, there cannot be any cognition of visual form as such. The colours, red and blue are visesas. But the visual form which underlies all these different manifestations is rupa samanya. So Rupa-tanmatra would mean Rupa-samanya, in which have disappeared all different manifestations or visesas of visuality. This tanmatra is so subtle and refined that it is always eluding human apprehension. It is accessible only to the Yogins and the gods. In the Bhamati it is said that the conch is shrouded with whiteness and appears as such to sight on account of dosas. If the whiteness arising out of error be not apprehended, then how can the absolutely unqualified conch be the subject of visual impression? If the conch does not appear before the sight, then how is the imposition of yellow in the conch to be explained? The rupas or affective qualities of the object under discussion are not apprehended, and yet the object has to be cognised. This is an anomalous position and cannot be true. The Tatparyaparisuddhi-prakasa tries to meet this objection. There might not be the cognition of the genus whiteness on the conch, because of error or dosa. But nevertheless, there is cognition of a species of whiteness. So a species of whiteness divorced from the genus whiteness flashes forth as visual image. The conch shell itself would have been invisible, if these species of whiteness had not been there. In the visual cognition of a particular form, there are certain rules, governing the relationship between matter and qualities. Further, the statement that it is a yellow conch-shell applies only to the colour yellow. But there must be beforehand, an appearance of the colour itself, without which the conch would not have appeared at all. The argument is put forward that there is no binding rule that in the visual cognition of a particular object, there should be cognition of its rupa as well. But how can an object be apprehended without its rupa being simultaneously cognised? The answer has been suggested that though there be non-cognition of rupa of the object, the appropriate white colour being inherent in the object (vastu-gatya), the object is cognised after all. So if there be cognition of particular manifestations of whiteness without an apprehension of whiteness itself, then there is an absolute disparity between two white things, without a generalised basis of whiteness. This cannot be taken to mean as tan-matra, which enters into all different manifestations of it. The Nyaya also does not

recognise that with the non-cognition of the generalised character of rupa, there is cognition of particular manifestations of it. To say so would be to admit tacitly that there is cognition of rupa-tanmatra. But rupa as such, divorced from these particular manifestations, cannot be the subject of the knowledge of sense.

All particular manifestations are rooted in a samanya basis. This universal nature of things manifests itself in these different particular forms. The samanya is the upadana or constituent of all particular manifestations. It is not possible for any one to take in all these different manifestations at the same time. So the pleasure arising out of the taking-in of these different manifestations is comprehended in the pleasure arising out of the enjoyment of samanya. The pleasure of samanya is exceedingly great and far surpasses the pleasure arising out of visesas. This pleasure of visesas is necessarily limited, circumscribed. But the purusa who enjoys samanya is a contented soul. The man who enjoys visesas, is always dissatisfied.

It is useful to remember here that according to the Vaicesika system, gandha-tanmatra, rupa-tanmatra are not gunas. The Vaicesika philosophers, speak of gandha, rupa and rasa as gunas; and they are essentially different from their substantial basis, dravya. But in the Samkhya analysis, the gunas and the guni, or guna and dravya are not essentially different. If these had been completely different, then the relation of guna and guni would not have subsisted at all. So a relation of the nature of bheda-abheda between guna and gunin has to be recognised. This bheda-abheda relationship goes by the name of tadatmya. The object and the qualities are similar in certain respects; in other respects, they are very different. The Vaicesikas recognise this tadatmya relationship with very great emphasis on absolute differentiation. But this is not proper, because recognition of relationship is at the root of all associative ideas. There cannot be any relationship with one's own self. So there cannot be any recognition of relationship (sammandha-prattiti) with one's own. What the Samkhya means by tadatmya or bheda-abheda-sammandha is nothing but bheda of qualities, and abheda as dravya or adhtkarana, -bheda-samanidhikarana abheda. In other words, the bheda-abheda relationship subsists between objects which are both similar and dissimilar in nature.

The Samkhya-Patanjala philosophy supports this bheda-

abheda relationship. The Patanjala Bhasya discusses this relationship at length ; but Iswarakrisna's Samkhya-karika is completely silent on it. This relationship has again been worked out at length in the commentary of Bhagavad Bhaskari. Bhagavad Bhaskari believes in creation as the evolution of Brahma. Evolution or parinama is by nature dependent on bheda-abheda. The Samkhya-Patanjala system also believes in evolution or parinama. This explains the bheda-abheda character of their philosophy. Beauty and beautiful form, smell and the sweet-smelling thing, are at once the same and different. There are bheda and abheda between beauty and the thing in which beauty subsists. This relationship which is at once the same and different, is known as bheda-abheda or tadatmya. So there is tadatmya relationship between beauty and beautiful form, between smell and the smelling thing. The Valcesika philosophers are surprised when it is stated that gandha-tanmatra is the constituent of earth, or rupa-tanmatra is the constituent of tejas. Gandha and rupa are qualities, while earth and fire are substances. Qualities cannot be constituent or upadana of substances. Dravyas can only be the upadana of other dravyas. This standpoint of Valcesika philosophy is of little significance. The Samkhya system on the other hand does not recognise a complete separation between beauty and beautiful form, or smell and the smelling thing. When the Samkhya speaks of gandha-samanya or rupa-samanya, or in other words, gandha-tanmatra or rupa-tanmatra, it does not mean thereby merely a quality, completely divorced from substance. Dravya is always characterised by gunas : yatra-srita karmaguna karanam samabayee yat (Caraka—Sutra-sthanam, I. 23)." The question arises if the earth springs out of only gandha-tanmatra, then there could be no cognition of rupa, rasa or sparsa in it. So if tejas springs out of only rupa-tanmatra, there could be no cognition or sensation of touch in it. The Samkhya process of evolution means that at the moment of the creation of akasa, there is only sabda-tanmatra. Vayu arises out of the mixing of sabda-tanmatra with sparsa-tanmatra. When rupa-tanmatra mixes with these two tanmatras, there is the emergence of tejas. These three tanmatras along with rasa-tanmatra are at the root of the emergence of apa. This compound of sabda-sparsa-rupa-rasa tanmatras by getting mixed with gandha-tanmatra, makes for the creation of prithvi. Out of one tanmatra springs akasa : out of two

emerges *vayu*, out of three, *tejas*, and *apa* springs out of four *tanmatras*, and earth out of five. The *akasa* is the most refined and subtle ; *vayu* comes next in the scale ; *tejas* is grosser, *apa* is even more gross, and earth is the most ponderous of them all. These differences in constituents also explain the different degrees of receptivity of them by different senses.

A particular point should be emphasized. Among all the different contributing causes in the working of *parinama*, only one becomes *upadana karana*. The rest will be all *niimitta karanas*. The causes are divisible, according to *Samkhya* analysis, into *upadana* and *niimitta*. Though the earth springs out of five elements or *tanmatra*, its constituent is *gandha-tanmatra*. The four other *tanmatras* are *niimitta-karana*. So also though water springs out of four *tanmatras*, its constituent or *upadana* happens to be *rasa-tanmatra*, the rest being all *niimitta-karanas*. So it is the case with *teja*, whose *upadana karana* is *rupa-tanmatra*, the rest being all *niimitta-karana*.

As one travels from constituent to constituent in *Samkhya* analysis, the basis is broadened and becomes more and more comprehensive, until the finality is reached in *prakriti*. The *Samkhya* speaks of this *prakriti* as *viswarupa*. This *prakriti* can assume any shape or form. The range of activities of the *prakriti* is beyond all comprehensions. This manifold world with all its diversity has sprung from one cause. This is the acme of philosophic thought. This is the height of speculative analysis. The *Samkhya* teachers are called *Brahma-vadi*, because they believe in this universalised nature of *Prakriti*. Just as *mrit-samanya* is infinitely more subtle and refined than earthen jars and pots, so also *gandha-tanmatra* is far more subtle and refined than *mrit-samanya*. The constituent of *gandha-tanmatra*, *ahamkara* or *buddhi-tattva* is again far more subtle and unmanifest than the product of which it is the constituent. *Prakriti* is the culmination or the end-point in which comprehension, subtlety and refinement have reached their fruition. All *jada-varga* is thus resolvable in *Samkhya*-analysis in this extremely subtle, all comprehensive *Prakriti*.

The relation of *karya-karana* in *Samkhya* system subsists only in *jada-varga*. The *purusa* is untouched by any *karya* or *karana*. In the analysis of the evolution of *panca-mahabhuta* from the *tanmatra*, it has been noticed that one *tanmatra* is the constituent or *upadana* of one *mahabhuta*.

while the remaining tan-matras are the nimitta-karanas. The characters of the upadana karana are usually manifest in the upadeya karya. This explains how the characters of the nimitta karana, the tan-matras are also recognisable in the pana-mahabhoota. This material universe is penetrated by the three qualities, priti, apriti and visada. These three qualities are sattva, rajas and tamas. The unbalance of these three qualities makes for creation; the achievement of balance leads to destruction or laya. The dominant guna in one particular karya becomes the upadana, while the subordinate ones are the nimitta karanas of the karya. In a Sattvic activity or karya, the Sattva guna becomes the upadana karana, and is dominant in it. The Rajas and Tamas gunas are present in an anga or subordinated form. The Samkhya looks at everything as being penetrated by these three gunas. The balance or unbalance are achieved because of the samaparinama or the visamaparinama of the gunas themselves. The Vyasa-bhasya of Patanjali divides the visible world into bhuta and indriya (II. 18). The bhutas are grahya; the indriyas are grahaka. These grahaka indriyas come out of ahamkara or buddhitattva. But grahya-grahaka objects proceed out of external objects. It seems that they cannot proceed out of ahamkara. The Nyaya speaks of the indriyas as "Bhautika". Eyes come out of tejas; ears out of akasa, the jnanendriyas out of prithvi, the taste organs out of water, and the sensation of touch out of vayu. But according to Samkhya analysis, the indriya-varga proceeds out of ahamkara. To say this is to say something which is self-contradictory. It is understandable that the senses or indriyas are made up of bhutas. But it is difficult to imagine how they can be ahamkarikas. It is necessary to analyse the concept of ahamkara for a proper understanding of this anomalous position.

The Samkhya-karika says, abhimano-ahamkara. By abhimana is meant the sense of self-hood or aham abhimana. The ahamkara manifests itself in such particular vrittis as "I am", "I go". The sense of self, "I" is at the root of the concept of ahamkara. There cannot be such a sense as "I am" unless ahamkara is penetrated by abhimana vritti. The first sensation after the awakening of purusa from susupti is this aham abhimana. This sense of "I" is because of this ahamkara. Unless there is this feeling of "I", there cannot be such sensations as "my body", "my senses". The sense of "I" must precede the sense of "my" or "mine". This

sense of myself or this possessive instinct is always referring to ahamkara. There cannot be any cognition or sphurana of an indriya or indriyārtha without this relation between ahamkara and senses having been first established. The sense of "I" or aham flashes forth ; and along with it, there is the flashing of indriya and visaya. There is no flashing of eye as such, or of ear as such. But the flashing is always of mine eyes, mine ears, when the relation of the senses with ahamkara has already been established. This possessive instinct first penetrates the indriyas ; and the indriyas flash forth with this ahamkara. It has already been noticed that the constituent of a particular thing is its samanya-rupa. It has also been seen how the visesas become apprehensible, only when they are penetrated by samanya-rupa. The indriyas are penetrated by ahamkara, and the indriya-vargas cannot become sphurad-rupa without the prior association with ahamkara. The natural corollary is that the constituent of indriyas is this ahamkara. A man freshly awakened from sleep, first has a sense of "I", there can be a sphurana of indriyas as "mine" only after this. Take away the sense of "I"; there is no longer any sphurana of indriyas. The sphurana of indriyas being always penetrated by ahamkara, it is possible to imagine ahamkara to be the constituent of indriyas. So also, the visayas or the objects flash forth, when these are penetrated with ahamkara. When an object flashes forth, then there is not this feeling that it is the object alone which is flashing. There is on the other hand the feeling that the object flashes to me, the object is seen by me, the object is being felt by me. In this way, all objects become vibrant or apprehensible when these are penetrated with ahamkara. So the samanya-rupa of all objects is again this ahamkara. The Mathore-vritti and the Tattva-samasa-sutra-vritti write, "rupē aham, rasē aham, gandhe aham". So the Tattva-samasa (p. 240) writes, "aham sparse, aham rupe, aham rase, aham gandhe, aham-swami dhanavan, ahameeswara". This aham vritti of ahamkara which is known as abhimana, is almost on the verge of extinction when one is fast asleep or susupta. So the senses and objects of sense are of no consequence to a man who is thus fast asleep. At the beginning of awakening of the susupta purusa, this aham vritti of ahamkara, known as abhimana, makes its appearance. Then there is a flashing of the senses and the objects of sense. The Samkhya Karika (Karika. 24) writes, "abhimano hamkara stasmadviveka pravartate sarga"

One tanmatra corresponds to one particular bhuta, and is its universal or samanya rupa. It being the samanya form of a particular bhuta, is its upadana. Similarly, ahamkara is the samanya or universal form of bhutas and indriyas alike. Just as rivers and streams flowing in different divergent directions lose their identity when they come to mingle in the ocean, so also grahya (bhuta) and grahaka (indriya) with different and opposed natures, lose all distinctions when they are stationed in ahamkara. Once again, just as the rivers and streams come out of the oceans, so also out of this ahamkara, proceed the grahya and the grahaka. This abhimana which has reference to oneself or aham, is the abhivyakti or manifestation of this ahamkara. Now all abhivyakti being particular manifestation, is interpenetrated with nischaya buddhi. When there is a vibrant manifestation or sphurana of aham abhimana, then it does so with the certainty that "It is I". There is never a sphurana as "It might be I" or "It might not be I". There is again no such sphurana as "It cannot be I". It is for this reason that the abhimana of aham being interpenetrated with this sense of certainty, this sense is the universal or samanya form of abhimana. The buddhi with its sense of certainty is thus the constituent of ahamkara. It being the constituent of ahamkara, is its samanya or universal form. The Samkhya Karika writes, prakriter mahan, tatohamkara. At the moment of susupti, there is the disappearance of buddhi-tattva. The constituents of buddhi-tattva, the three gunas rest in a perfect equipoise, leading to the disappearance of the buddhi-tattva. With the disappearance of the buddhi-tattva, the jiva is susupta, or becomes extinct, or on the verge of laya. Susupti has thus been called the daily extinction of the jiva. If on the other hand, the constituents of the whole universe, the three gunas rest in a perfect equipoise, then there is extinction of the whole cosmic order of things.

It must have been noted from the foregoing analysis that the samanya or upadana of the indriyas is asmita or ahamkara. Both jnanendriyas and karmendriyas (See Introduction, Sec. III) are manifestation of this samanya, asmita. This manifestation is made possible only through the play of sakti. The world of sights and sounds (See Ch. II) brings about a change or transformation in the indriyas, ears and eyes. Asmita or manas or the visuddha-sattva is thus of the nature of Sakti, through the manifestation of which, vibhavas are assimilated and Rasa-enjoyment is made possi-

ble. The evolution of visesas from the samanya is thus always the play of Sakti. Prakriti or Samanya in Samkhya analysis is sakti-swarupa (See Ch. IV). The jnanendriyas, like caksu, srotra and jivha are all activated by asmita or abhimana, just as the karmendriyas, like pada, pani and upastha are all animated by asmita.

This Maha-samanya in Samkhya analysis is Prakriti; the Maha-samanya in Vedanta is Brahma. The world of sights and sounds and tastes is only the manifestation of this maha-samanya. The underlying principle of individuation of Prakriti in Samkhya, and Brahma in Vedanta is Sakti-swarupa. Name and form are used in the Upanishads to indicate individuality (See Brhad-aranyaka Upanishad. 1. 4. 7). The development of the one into the many is the rise of name and form out of the primary principle. There is no suggestion that the modifications denoted by name and form are unreal. They have, of course, no reality apart from the Brahman. Nama-rupa is not what the English words name and form indicate. They correspond to the form and matter of Aristotle. The two together constitute the individuals of the world.* In Buddhism, rupa stands for the gross body, and nama for the subtle mind. The Abhidhamma philosophy in discussing Pattecasamuppada, the law of "this arises depending on that", analyses in detail the relation between Nama and Rupa. In Abhidhamma Philosophy, Book I. Ch. VIII. Sec. 2. p. 113 (ed. by Bhikkhu Kashyap) the following sequence of dependent relationship is noted, the driving force in each case being ignorance. Depending on ignorance (Avijja), there arises the activities of life (sankhara). Depending on the activities (that yield vipaka), there arises Patissandhi consciousness (Vinnana) (in another birth after the expiry of this life). Depending on Patissandhi Consciousness, there arise the mental and the physical states of the being (Nama-Rupa). Depending on the mental and the physical states, there arise the six Ayatana, namely, eye, ear, nose, tongue, body and mind (Salayatana). Bhava comes after a long process of differentiation and individuation; and "thus does originate the whole body of evils". Bharata's concept of bhava is not essentially different from the Abhidhamma standpoint (See Ch. II. p. 45-48, and Ch. XI).

The common substratum in Samkhya analysis is Pra-

* Indian Philosophy. vol. I p. 188 Sir S. Radhakrishnan. (1918).

† Abhidhamma Philosophy. vol. I. p. 214—ed. by Kashyap.

kriti ; in Vedānta, it is Brahman ; in Buddhism, it is Avijjā. The parting of ways between psychical and physiological functions and concepts in Sāṃkhya system takes place at the manas stage. It is at this stage that there is for the first time, a bi-furcation of jñānendriya and karmendriya (See Introduction, Sec. III). Such parting of ways in Buddhism takes place in Paṭisandhi consciousness, when for the first time it divides itself into name and rūpa. The driving force which brings about differentiation in the undifferentiated Prakṛiti or Brahman is of the nature of śakti. The tattva or the philosophy of this Śakti, which alone makes possible all enjoyment of Rāsa is taken up for detailed discussion in Chapters IV and V.

II

When a Rāsa is tasted on the palate, then it is either sweet or bitter, salt or astringent. A Rāsa can be tasted only when it is imposed with a particular form, or when it is in a particular state. These sweet or acid tastes are once again not tasted as just sweet or acid, but are tasted as excessively sweet, or moderately sweet, or even mildly sweet. So it is the case with bitter or astringent Rasas. There is a universal content or form of these six Rasas, madhura, āmla, etc. Sweetness or acidity are the particular manifestation or coloration of this one universal or samānya Rāsa. Each of these six particular manifestations undergoes different transformations, as it becomes characterised by the *qualities in an excess or moderate or mild degree*. When sweetness is tasted by the mouth, then the taste of it does not appear as just sweet, but its appearance is characterised by all such manifest forms as excess or moderation of it. There is a regular gradation and an infinite range of intensity in a particular Rāsa. Though words might be lacking to denote all these different stages of intensification, these different stages can be felt and appreciated by many men. The sugar-cane, the condensed milk and guda are all sweet. But each of these different varieties of sweetness has a very distinctive stamp. The sweetness of sugar-cane is very different from the sweetness of condensed milk, and so on. Though all these three different things are very distinct in their sweetness, there is no possibility of clearly denoting them by words, because words are lacking which can indicate

selves are upadeya or visesa. The Samkhya system is always speaking of the samanya as upadana, and the visesa as upadeya.⁶⁰ The samanya rupa of sparsa or rasa, completely divorced from all particular manifestations, is not accessible to us. In other words, the substantial basis or the upadana of a particular manifestation, can never be the subject of human knowledge. Unless this samanya rupa be wedded to a particular form, there is no cognition whatsoever.

This samanya character of a thing has been called in Samkhya analysis tan-matra. There are five such tan-matras, as rupa-tanmatra, rasa-tanmatra, etc. The Samkhya does not recognise an absolute distinction between guna and gunin. When the Samkhya speaks of rupa, it means thereby not beauty as such, but an object which is beautiful. The absolute distinction between beauty and the beautiful form is the standpoint of Vaicesika system. But in the Samkhya scheme, the object itself is beautiful. An object can never be dissociated from form and shape, smell and taste. But in Vaicesika analysis, beauty and the object which is beautiful are quite distinct. Though rupa is to be taken in by the eye, the Samkhya holds that it is not possible for the eye to take in the universal form of rupa. This universal form of rupa is not penetrated or limited by particular manifestations of rupa, as green, blue or red. The rupa in which all particular manifestations have set (pratyastamita) or are incognisable (anabhivyakta), is known as Rupa-tanmatra. Rupa tan-matra as such, is not the object of sense-knowledge. It is available only to the Yogins and the gods.

The samanya character comprehends all particular manifestations. But a particular manifestation cannot be comprehended in another particular manifestation. The samanya state comprehending all particular manifestations, is of a universal nature. So if it were possible to enjoy the samanya state, the pleasure arising out of it, would be exceedingly great. It would be more intense than what it would be out of the enjoyment of particular states. It is because the pleasure arising out of the enjoyment of a particular state, is not comprehended in the pleasure arising out of a different state. It is for this reason that the samanya character of gandha and rasa is said to be gandha-matrika and rasa-matrika, out of which spring all particular manifestations of gandha and rasa. All possible manifestations are comprehended in this mother of these all, this samanya nature of gandha and rasa. The receptivity of human

indriyas is very weak. The indriyas cannot take in the intense degree of manifestation of a particular guna, or the infinitely subordinated manifestation of another guna. It appears as dark both when the light is very dim, or when it is excessively bright. Human indriyas are adapted only to take in the middle states. The tongue cannot taste an excessively sweet thing. Such an object would appear as bitter to most men. But if the senses had been more powerful than what they are now, then an excessively sweet thing instead of appearing as bitter, would have appeared what it actually is. The pleasure arising out of it would correspondingly be of a much more intense nature. But it is not possible, because of the comparative weakness of human senses. Human organs of vision cannot take in either a very distant thing, or a thing which is next to the eye. These can only take in things, which are placed mid between. If it were possible to take in things which are far and near, along with things which are placed mid between, then the pleasure arising out of it would obviously be very great. But it is hardly possible, because of the incapacity of human organs of sense.

It might be of interest to note that the same position has been accepted in European philosophy. In *De Anima*. 426b, Aristotle says similarly that the organs of perception can only receive the middle states. "If voice implies a concord, and if the voice and the hearing of it are in one sense one and the same, and if concord always implies a ratio, hearing as well as what is heard must be a ratio. That is why the excess of either the sharp or the flat destroys the hearing. So also in the case of savours, excess destroys the sense of taste, and in the case of colours, excessive brightness or darkness destroys the sight, and in the case of smells, excess of strength whether in the direction of sweetness or bitterness is destructive. This shows that the sense is a ratio". By ratio, Aristotle refers to the visesa character of objects of sense, for samanya is ubiquitous, without any reference or ratio to anything else.

Again, Aristotle writes in *De Anima*, 426c, "That is also why the objects of sense are (1) pleasant when the sensible extremes such as acid or sweet, or salt being pure and unmixed are brought into proper ratio; then they are pleasant: and in general what is blended is more pleasant than the sharp and the flat alone; or to touch, that which is capable of being either warmed or chilled; the sense and

the ratio are identical; while (2) In excess the sensible extremes are painful and destructive.

The universal content of rupa and rasa is not perceptible to human senses. But the indriyas of the gods and the yogins can look through the surface appearance, and take in the tanmatras as well. This taking-in of the tanmatras explains the very great delight of the yogins, even when they are enjoying ordinary objects of sense. They look through these objects of sense, and take in their universalised general character. In Alamkara literature, there are about eight or nine Rasas, like Sringara and Karuna. But there is underlying these all, the universalised general nature of Rasa. This universal general character of Rasa or its samanya rupa, is always manifesting itself in all these nine different Rasas. Sringara is as much a Rasa as Karuna is. Sringara and Karuna can have no separate existence, apart from the universalised nature of Rasa samanya. At the moment of apprehending Sringara and Karuna, this samanya nature of Rasa is being taken in along with such particular manifestations. This samanya is always being penetrated by visesa at the moment of Rasa realisation. It cannot be definitely said if there be such a thing as samanya vastu, completely separated and divorced from all particular manifestations. If there had not been any such samanya vastu, then how were it possible for these particular manifestations to flash out? Their flashing out is a proof that these had been interpenetrated with this samanya character.

It should be clearly understood that though there is an infinite diversity in the sakti of Rasa, Rasa itself is essentially one. It is because of this sakti that Rasa manifests itself. This sakti or upadhi is the body or deha of Rasa. It might be unmanifest in a very subtle form in rasa; or it may be clearly manifest in a grosser form. Rasa is ever associated with this sakti or deha. The separation into deha and dehin, as in the prakrita world, is not there in the visesa manifestation of the samanya rasa. The sakti or upadhi of Rasa is its deha. Even if Rasa be one, and even though there is no sa-jatiya,⁸¹ or vi-jatiya⁸² or swagata bheda⁸³ in it, it cannot be denied that the visesa manifestation of the samanya rasa is equally true. The one Rasa becomes diversified as the result of different vibhavas and anu-bhavas. It is needless to add that this is from the standpoint of the average reader. But even here the vibhavas are a part and parcel of rasa. The knowledge of ghata

(ghata-jnana) is impossible without the ghata itself, yet akhanda-jnana is self subsistent (nirvisayaka).⁸⁴ Similarly, khanda rasa without the vibhavas and anubhavas cannot be imagined ; yet there is no manifestation of the vibhavas and anubhavas in Rasa-samanya. When the vritti is viksipta, the bheda-bodha is clearly present, and non-identity of the vibhavas (See Ch. II) with the subject must be admitted. In Rasa realisation, the vibhavas are equally present. But these flash as anga of Rasa, and as non-different from it. This is what is called visista Rasa. In Rasa samanya, there is, of course, no room for vibhavas. But there cannot be any enjoyment of Rasa samanya, except through visista rasa. At the moment of the sphurana of visista rasa, there is the simultaneous presence of Rasa samanya. In other words, the samanya and visesa are happily blended together in Rasa enjoyment. With the nirodha of the visesa portion, the samanya portion is left over. The golden bangle is nothing but gold in a particular shape ; and the two are held together in deep embrace (tadatmya). When one looks at the bangle, one sees gold as well. So when one enjoys visista rasa, like Sringara and Hasa, or Madhura and Amla, one enjoys also Rasa samanya. The samanya Rasa itself becomes individualised into visista Rasa, as a result of this visesa manifestation. When the distinctiveness (or visesamsa) is taken away, or when this becomes unmanifest, Rasa is of a samanya nature. This is nir-visesa, or nir-akara, without any manifestation at all. The nature of visesa which gives form and shape, a local habitation and a name to this samanya character, shall have to be examined in detail here and in the following chapter.

This visesa may be looked upon as upadhi⁸⁵. The bheda implicit in upadhi, brings about the differentiation in Rasa. So long as one is under the dominance of viksipta vritti, this upadhi is bahya and anitya. In reality, this upadhi is neither bahya nor anitya. So visesa is ever associated intimately with Rasa. Rasas are always many in number, and one Rasa is naturally distinct from all others. The statement Rasa is one and unique is not incompatible with the statement that Rasas are many in number. Rasa is at once one and many ; and this explains the essential nature of reality.

The upadhi is of the nature of sakti. Everything in this world is upadhi-swarupa. It must be remembered that nothing in this world is a-nitya or a-sat. A particular form in which a thing is manifest, or becomes visible or aces-

sible, but which is never again possible in this world, is a-sat. Every moment brings about a change. But what is the nature of this change? Different rupas appear in succession. In other words, the citta which sees or hears is gradually transformed into various vrittis. There is no rupa without vritti, just as there is no vritti without rupa. The two are inseparably associated together. The stream, known as kala-srota, flows on for ever. This cannot be checked by one in a viksipta mood. But if by any means, this ever-flowing stream can be checked, it will lead to sthairyra. In other words, if vritti be sthira, rupa becomes sthira; the sthairyra or rupa in its turn, leads to the sthairyra of vritti. So the manifestation of a particular thing in a state of concentration (ekagravastha) is not fleeting or illusory. So long as there is concentration, there shall be before this sthira-vritti, rupa in an immutable and unchanging form. If this concentration be self-willed, or under self-control, and if one could rise above the turbidity of the changing prakriti, then the duration of the rupa also can be controlled at will. If for instance, there be prajna through concentration on a particular rose, and if that concentration or samadhi lasts for a thousand years, then that rose shall be present there for a thousand years. It will survive all changes of a viksipta citta. The concentration or samadhi is short-lived, because the roots of disturbance are ever present in the citta. But when the roots are exterminated (See Chs. IX, X and XI), or when rajas and tamas disappear and sattva becomes purified, then samadhi shall not pass away, and its duration will be self-willed. All the several rupas of the universe are a particular manifestation or prakasa, an aspect of maha-prakasa or the Great Illumination. It is possible to revive that very same form even after the disappearance of samadhi, or if it disappears through the exercise of one's will. Though it may have disappeared from the world, it is ever present before that Great Illumination. It only becomes unmanifest before the vritti-jnana. If this be correct, then all rupas are nitya; all things are by nature, true. The manifest form is existent, so long as one wills it; and as such, it is not outward form, but essentially one and identical with the Illumination.

If upadhi be ever associated intimately with prakasa, then there is for all time, an infinite diversity of rasas. But human knowledge being essentially an outcome of vritti, rasas might sometimes become unmanifest. When the veil

is removed, and avarana is taken away, then there is the manifestation of this ever present Rasa. It has to be admitted that the number and character of particular Rasas are countless. Sometimes, the visesa Rasa is unmanifest in the form of Sakti. Or it might be present in a manifest form. Though Rasa may be essentially one, there is in it Sakti for an infinite diversity. It is only at times that this sakti manifests itself. It is through swatantrya that Rasa manifests its infinite diversity, or takes into itself its manifest form. This sakti or upadhi is the deha of Rasa. It might be present in a very subtle form in Rasa, or it may be manifest in a gross, tangible form. There is an identity, or non-difference between this manifest form (deha) and rasa.

This is what happens in the suddha-vastha. A similar position is held in the sensuous world of sight, sound and taste. There is a deep significance in the infinite diversity of the world of sense. The facial appearance of each man, or each member of a particular species of bird and beast, a particular tree, or creeper or a little flower is the manifestation or vikasa in a tangible form of a particular bhava or rasa. These may not be pure manifestation. Man himself being the manifestation of a particular bhava, his physical form changes, according to the changing pattern of the particular bhava, of which he is the embodiment. Appearance is the deha of bhava, and is, as such, identical with it. On ultimate analysis, it will appear that there is manifestation of a particular bhava in a particular body. There are as many dehas as there are bhavas. There cannot be many bhavas, centering round one deha, though there may be many vilasas of one particular deha.

Visesa or bheda naturally goes with samanya or a-bheda, just as a-bheda is inseparable from bheda. The two are one. There is a-bheda even in bhedavastha; this a-bheda or samanya character, when over-whelmed is unmanifest in bhedavastha. So also in abhedavastha, there is the simultaneous presence of bheda. In reality, no one is the samyavastha, or the complete reality (See Ch. IX). The samyabhava is neither jiva-bhava nor iswara-bhava, neither bheda or many, nor a-bheda or one. It is both bheda and a-bheda, both many and one.

The Indian philosophers are divided on the question if there be such an entity as pure universality, without any visesa whatsoever. Kumārila Bhatta writes, nirvisesam na

samanya, or samanya is impossible where visesa is absent. But Kumarila's view is very gross. The Samkhya accepts the presence of nirvisesa samanya, or samanya without the simultaneous presence of visesa. The particular visesa states are appearing from the samanya nature, and once again, are getting absorbed and disappearing in it. The visesas are like wavelets, appearing on the surface of the sea of samanya. All visesas are sustained, because they are rooted in this samanya basis. If there had not been this samanya, then the visesas would have disappeared altogether. But so strong is the love for visesas, and so varied is their appeal, that very often the universal character of Rasa, in which are rooted all these visesas, is likely to be ignored. But it is useful to remember that the universal nature of Rasa is the constituent of all these different Rasas. The Upanishads also speak of this Rasa samanya, when they identify Brahma with Rasa itself, and not with any particular manifestation of it. The Upanishads write *Raso vai sa. Rasa hyabhyasam labdhwa anandi bhavati*. This is Rasa samanya. Rasa samanya is the mother of all particular manifestations; it is a state in which are comprehended all different manifestations of Rasa. To take in this Rasa samanya, without the simultaneous apprehension of all different manifestations of it, is like apprehending Brahma Himself. Brahma is nothing but the universal nature of things, in which are comprehended everything else. He is Mahasamanya. The grammarians also speak of "saa jati, saa mahanatma". Out of this universalised nature of things, all different particular manifestations proceed. It is in this universalised nature once again, that every thing else is comprehended. The Sruti in indicating the character of Brahma emphasizes His universal samanya nature. The Sruti writes, *Jato ba eemany bhutani jayante, jena jatani jeevanti*. This is Brahma. This universal nature of things is the resting-point of the evolution, manifestation and involution of all particular states; this is what Brahma is in the purest sense. The word Brahma means Brhat or great. This great Brahma becomes limited or circumscribed as there is the manifestation of a particular state. The manifestation of a particular state is the manifestation of the littleness in man; the manifestation of the universal state is to be like Brahma. This universal nature of Brahma has been called bhuma. The Chandogya writes (17. 13. 1), *jo vai bhuma tat sukham; nalpe sukhamasti bhumaiva sukham*. Brahma

is bliss itself ; there is no sukha in the limited spheres of life. In speaking of the criteria of bhuma, the Chandogya writes again (17. 14. 1), yatra nanyam pasyati nanyatchrinoti, nanyat-vijanati, sa bhuma yo bai bhuma tadamritam, yadalpam tanmartam. That in which nothing else is visible, nothing else is audible, or nothing else is knowable, is bhuma. Bhuma is life everlasting ; alpa or limited life is life subject to death and decay.

The analysis of samanya and visesa of Rasa in Sec. II, must have pointed out that all particular manifestations must be rooted in a samanya basis. This applies not merely to the different manifestations of the same thing, appealing to one particular indriya. It appears that there is a samanya basis of the Rasa speculations in Ayurveda and in Alamkara.

This samanya basis, as has been already pointed out, is the asmita, whose manifest form, or sakti-rupa is the manas or visuddha sattva. Looking at buddhi, aham and manas as dravya, kriya and sakti it will be seen that manas is sakti-rupa, because it is kriya in its unmanifest as also in its fully developed form ; aham is the act of grahana, and buddhi is of the nature of dravya. Buddhi has often been called the dravya of purusa—dravyamatram-bhoot sattvam purusa-syetti nischaya.

The antah-karana is not exempt from the operation of the three gunas. The parinama of asmita is threefold ; the first parinama is prakhya-pradhana, leading to the evolution of the jnanendriyas ; the second parinama is pravritti-pradhana, leading to the evolution of the karmendriyas ; and the third parinama is sthiti-pradhana or prana. The sthiti-pradhana asmita⁷ is the deha or dharya-visaya. This is the seat of the karanas. The asmita which is predominantly pravritti-pradhana provides incentive to activities. The dhruta-bhava, corresponding to pravritti-pradhana asmita, is karmendriya. The prakasa-bhava, corresponding to prakhya-pradhana asmita, is jnanendriya. It has already been noted in the Introduction, Sec. IV, how there is a natural correlation between the five jnanendriyas and the five karmendriyas. The foregoing analysis must have revealed how the pravritti-pradhana asmita, the subject-matter of investigation in Ayurveda, and the prakhya-pradhana asmita, the subject-matter of analysis in Alamkara, naturally go together. Both are held together in the sthiti-pradhana asmita or the deha. The manas or the visuddha-sattva is its sakti-rupa, which makes possible the transformation of all ahara in the form of vibhava,

(See Ch. II). into rasa. Asmita is thus the samanya basis of Rasa speculations in Alamkara and Ayurveda.

In Ch. II, it has been noticed how manas seated in the hrdaya, gathers all sense-impressions or ahara. It has been noticed further that sabda, sparsa, rupa, rasa are all taken in through the mediation of vayu. It should be clearly recognised that just as madhura, amla are taken in by the palate and brought to manas, so also the different shades of light, and the different degrees of sound are brought to manas by the eye and the ear. Human indriyas are capable of receiving only the particular manifestations or visesa rupa of this samanya rasa. It appears that the sister speculations of Alamkara and Ayurveda separated out, as the emphasis was placed on the visesa character of the Rasa, arising out of ahara brought in by two different senses. But the samanya nature of these two different Rasas is nevertheless unmistakable. When the samanya nature of these two speculations is emphasized, it will be seen that Sringara and Madhura, Hasa and Amla are one and the same. They appear different only because the grahaka indriyas are different in the two cases. All five mahabhootas enter into the making of everything. The relative predominance of one mahabhoota in one indriyarthā accounts for how one indriyarthā is to be taken in by the eye, or by the tongue. But that is no reason why the taking-in of the indriyarthā by the eye (drśya), or by the ear (śravya) should be essentially different from the indriyarthā taken in by the palate (swadya). These different indriyas only take in the visesa rupa of the one samanya rasa. So while Sringara and Madhura, and Hasa and Amla are different to outward view, their taking-in by the ear and the eye and the tongue points to the samanya character, which underlies them all. This samanya concept knits together the speculations of Alamkara and Ayurveda.

CHAPTER IV

Concept of Visuddha-sattva in Philosophy and Aesthetics

It has been noted in Ch. I. Sec. II, that at the core of Rasa-realisation, there is the play and manifestation of sakti. It should be clearly recognised that Rasa enjoyment would be impossible without the activities of this cit-sakti. The jiva loses his jivatva on the flames of this cit-sakti and becomes transformed into siva. The operations of cit-sakti make possible this transformation of the jiva into siva⁹. It is well-known that the finest form of aesthetic delight often proceeds out of pity and fear, sorrow and lamentations.* The transformation and transmutation of pity and fear, which are under the dominance of rajas and tamas (See Ch. XI), must precede aesthetic enjoyment. The transmutation of the sthayi-bhavas into rasas is thus the result of the operations of sakti. The assimilation of ahara in the form of vibhavas (See Ch. II) is also the result of the operations of sakti. The vibhava being ahara, is a distinct entity, separate from the bhokta or the enjoyer. The two, the bhokta and the bhogya or ahara, can become one only through the operations of sakti. The nectar of the soma melts, when it comes in touch with the agni (See Ch. IX). This molten state, in which all distinctions are lost, is eminently the result of the play of sakti. The other approach is the one, which believes in separateness, or rigidity. According to this second view, the jiva is still a jiva, even after purification from mala. The jiva can never attain siva-tva.

It should be noted further that the sakti which comes into operation in Rasa enjoyment, is the cit-sakti. Being cit-sakti, the enjoyment proceeding out of its operations, is the enjoyment of bhoga, or taking in outside things as ahara (See Ch. II) and making them its own. This is very different from the Vedantic maya, which is of the nature of jada-sakti. There can be no aesthetic enjoyment with jada-

⁹ The doctrine of Katharsis in Aristotle's *Poetics*, ch. vi, is a defence of Poetry against Plato's charges that poetry "feeds and waters the passions" in Republic 606. See also "A new interpretation of the Doctrine of Katharsis in Aristotle's *Poetics*—Sen. (Calcutta Review—June 1950).

sakti. The only pleasure possible in the case of jada-sakti is the pleasure of renunciation.-This second standpoint is echoed in the Bhagavad-Gita, where it speaks of rasa-varjan nīraharasya dehina. Bharata's rasa-analysis which begins with the taking-in of ahara, can never think of this path of renunciation. This is more because, the standpoint of the Bhagavad-Gita, is the way of sakti-tyaga, while the one of Bharata is essentially the path of sakti-grahana. (See Chs. I and V). The advaita stand-point, advocated by the Saivas, the Vaisnavas or the Saktas is not opposed to either bhakti-sadhana, or the Rasa-enjoyment. It is because the advaita standpoint advocated in these systems is the result not of any renunciation of sakti, but the result of the acceptance of the doctrine of sakti. The Mahayana Buddhists similarly accept the reality of Prajna-paramita, and have thus paved the way to the doctrine of Bodhi-sattva-vada. The advaita-vada of the Panca-ratris is similarly the result of a perfect harmony between sakti and saktiman. All these clearly indicate the very great importance of the concept of sakti in Rasa enjoyment.

The Maha-sakti which lies unmanifest in Him, first appears at His behest, like the flash of lightning. Though there is even in the unmanifest, avyakta stage, difference between the sakti and the saktiman, there is as yet no realisation of it. The Samkalpa or the wish which stimulates the dormant Maha-sakti is the anirvacaneeya svatantra of the Lord. Only a part of the Sakti is awakened, while the rest of it remains unmanifest. The manifest sakti may be either kriya-sakti or the bhuti-sakti. This kriya-sakti has been referred to as the Saundarsani Kala in the Ahirbudhnya Samhita. This is ever unchanged. But the bhuti-sakti unlike the kriya-sakti, is ever active. Compared to kriya-sakti, the bhuti-sakti is infinitesimally small. The kriya sakti is alone responsible at the moment of creation, for the parinama in the mula prakriti, for the Kalana in Kala, and for the bhoga in the atman. It shall be seen how all these three positions, the parinama in the prakriti, kalana in the kala, and bhoga in the atman are implicit in the doctrine of rasa. All these again are the result of the play of sakti, without which rasa-realisation would become an impossibility.

It should be noted further that the swarupa-sakti, or the cit-sakti is ever present in the swarupa of the Brahman. All the powers and whatever characterises the Brahman proceed from this swarupa-sakti. So the Brahman's nature

as Rasa, both as something to be tasted and enjoyed (as aswadya), and as one who tastes It (as aswadaka) is the result of this swarupa-sakti. This swarupa-sakti, being cit-sakti, is naturally endowed with cetana. So it can diversify the ananda-maya nature of the Brahman. It itself can assume diverse forms and shapes.

The swarupa-sakti, which is natural to Brahman, assumes two different roles in the matter of Rasa enjoyment. In one role, it makes possible the relish of the ananda by the reader or enjoyer; in another role, it makes the ananda itself relishable. In both forms, it infinitely diversifies itself and the ananda.

Coming to the diverse manifestations of the relish or taste, it will be seen that the relish of sweetness is the sakti of the thing, which itself is sweet. Sweetness may be of very different nature, for instance the sweetness of palm-candy, sweetness of sugar, and of different kinds of fruits. Though all these are sweet, the sweetness of each one of them is different from the sweetness of another. This is the visesa manifestation of the samanya sweetness (See Ch. III). Again, the different constituents of palm-candy, sugar are all the result or parinama of the same trigunatmika maya. The maya, charged with gunas, is transformed into all these diverse forms and shapes, when it is acted upon by the cit-sakti of the para-Brahma. So the upadana or the constituent of all these different things, may be said to be the result or parinama of the same trigunatmika maya. The same sweetness assumes diverse forms, when it comes in contact with the upadana of different things, and so makes these different things sweet in different degrees. At the same time, it itself assumes different forms. Similarly, the swarupa, self-same, and unique ananda on coming in contact with His swarupa-sakti, becomes infinitely diversified, and so in turn, becomes relishable.

Rasa as relish and rasa as the one, who relishes it, together make the Rasa-tattva. These two aspects of Rasa-tattva are ever present in Him. It has already been noticed how Brahman becomes relishable as a result of the operations of sakti. The swarupa-sakti is ever inseparable from the Brahman. So kriya and the result of this kriya, infinite diversity of this sakti and the ananda proceeding out of this infinite diversity of sakti, and the diversity of ananda itself, are all present from time immemorial in Brahman. This ananda is being enjoyed as rasa. It naturally follows there-

fore, that rasa-enjoyment is the result of a deep embrace with sakti. Sakti in its diverse manifestations makes possible the enjoyment of Rasa.

I

If Rasa enjoyment be inseparable from cit-sakti, it is important to analyse the concept of cit-sakti in detail. This cit-sakti is inseparable once again from the concept of visuddha-sattva, an idea which has dominated Indian thought for centuries. It has already been noticed that the complete theory of Rasa includes both the aswadya rasa and the aswadaka rasa. It should be noticed further that the concept of the aswadya rasa has been analysed in Ch. II, and the concept of samanya rasa has been discussed in Ch. III. The concept of aswadaka rasa, or the visuddha-sattva (which is inseparable from cit-sakti) will have to be taken up here and in the next chapter.

It should be noticed further that the operations of the cit-sakti, or the visuddha-sattva are dependent on the achievement of certain preliminary conditions, on the laukika plane. The laukika plane in the case of Rasa realisation, is obviously made up of the vibhavas, anubhavas, vyabhicharibhavas, a detailed analysis of which will be found in Chapters II, VII, and VIII. Nobody would ever identify the bliss of aesthetic enjoyment with vibhava, anubhava or vyabhicharibhava, which are all constituents of Rasa. Rasa, though it springs from them, is nevertheless, categorically different from vibhava or anubhava. The unmanifest sakti brings about a change from bhava to rasa, and the laukika vibhava, anubhava and vyabhicharibhava are transformed into rasa. There is always this parinama of bhava into rasa. This is made possible because of the presence of sakti. This sakti is the visuddha-sattva, which is the subject-matter of the present chapter, as also of the next.

The Samkhya system which attempts to give an adequate explanation of the evolving world, looks at all parinama as due to the inherent sakti, or nature of the primeval prakriti. It should be noted that prakriti evolves, not because of any outside interference, but because of its own inherent sakti. The early Samkhya writers speak of a

visuddha prakriti, the repository of all sakti. The sakti-tattva offers a philosophical explanation of the theory of Rasa (See Ch. I Sec. II). Sakti-tattva serves to connect further the philosophical interpretation of Rasa from the Patanjala standpoint with the interpretation offered from the standpoint of the Vedanta of Ramanuja, Vailabha and Nimbarka. It is essentially the same as the analysis of sakti in the Mahayana, as also in the Saiva and Sakta Tantras. In Ch. III, in the discussion of samanya rasa, it has been noticed what an important place is occupied by the doctrine of sakti. The visesa manifestation of the samanya rasa is the result of the play of sakti. In this chapter and in the next, the theoretical or tattvic background of the concept of Rasa is taken up for a detailed investigation. A careful examination of the nature of this sakti is necessary for a clearer understanding of the philosophy of aesthetic enjoyment. This sakti underlies all manifestations, or parinati, and transition from bhava to rasa is no exception. The discussion of sakti-tattva should thus properly begin with an analysis of evolution from the standpoint of parinama-*vaadin Samkhya of Caraka-Patanjali.*

The concept of sakti in Patanjala-Samkhya is again not very different from the concept of sakti in the philosophical schemes of Ramanuja, Nimbarka, Madhva and Vailabha. The Vyasa-bhasya I. 3, writes, *swarupa-pratistha tadaneem citisaktir-yatha kaivyaale, vyuthana-citte tu sati tatha-pi bhavantee na tatha.* At this stage, the cit-sakti is centred in itself. In Vyasa-bhasya I. 4, it is similarly held, *vyuthane ya citta-vrittaya tada-visista-vritti purusa.*" The *drasta-purusa is of the nature of caitanya. The buddhi, on coming in contact with the cit or purusa, reveals the world of sense. All which appear and are visible, are drsya. Rupa, rasa are all external manifestations or drsya. These become visible, because the cit which reveals all, is of the nature of sakti. The common standpoint in all such statements as "I see", "I hear", "I decide" or "I understand" is "I". The central point of interest in all these positions, is the seer, the purusa. The purusa is of the nature of cit. The buddhi can only reveal the sense-world (See Ch. II), when it is imposed upon, and activated by cit. So cit-sakti is indispensable in revealing the world of sense. The Patanjala concept of sakti runs through the full scale of creation or beings. It is implied thereby that drsya, citta, abhimana-ahamkara, ahamasmi buddhi, vivekaja-jnana, or purusa-pratyaya stand*

in a hierarchy, where each posterior stage is charged with a sakti to reveal the anterior.

The Patanjala school of Samkhya holds that a nonentity can never come into existence, and an entity can never pass away. The primary prakriti is at the basis of all manifestations. From prakriti evolves mahat, or the great cosmic principle. It is also called buddhi, as it is held to be the cosmic matter of experience. The reason of calling it mahat lies in the fact that it is great in space as well as in time; for there is no other evolved principle, which is so extensive and durable as this is. In the *Yoga-bhāṣya*, I. 36, it is described as an extensive transparent stuff like the bright sky. It should be remembered that mahat is little else but a comprehensive collection of jñāna-sakti. Mahan and full-knowledge are synonymous. This extensive jñāna-sakti, without any deficiency, is known in the Samkhya system as mahat-tattva, or buddhi-tattva. This buddhi unlike the purusa, is unconscious, or jada. It is for this reason that the Samkhya holds that on the surface of this jada, buddhi is reflected the great purusa, who is Isvara in the Samkhya philosophy.

In holding that the prakriti is always undergoing changes, the Samkhya system acknowledges the role of sakti in the cosmic creation. It has already been noticed how the repository of this sakti in Samkhya-Patanjala is the mahat-tattva. A closer analysis will reveal that the Samkhya standpoint on Rasa (this being the proper background of Bharata. See Ch. VI) is not different from the Vedantic standpoint of Ramanuja, Nimbarka, Madhva and Vallabha. (See Sec. V-VI). Kapila explains mahat as "mahadakhyaṁ-adyam karyam tan-mana". By this, Kapila probably meant an unlimited, uncircumscribed, visuddha buddhi, which is not clouded by the array of viśayas. At the very beginning, there was present only the purusa, who is of the nature of cit. So the first evolute of prakriti, the mahat tattva does little else but reflects the cit-atma. There is nothing to limit or circumscribe it. This is the mahat-tattva in the form of visuddha-buddhi. This is the concept of sakti in Patanjala-Samkhya. This is jñāna-sakti, or cit-sakti. This is the dominating idea of not merely Patanjala-Samkhya, but also of Ramanuja, Madhva, Nimbarka and Vallabha. It may be noted here that the earliest Samkhya speaks of visuddha prakriti, in which lie unmanifest all energy and activity, and which acts as a storehouse and reservoir of all sakti.

It is necessary to pursue the concept of sakti in the Samkhya-system, as parinama-vada which occupies a very prominent place in this philosophy, is also the result of the play of sakti. Before taking up the concept of parinama-vada in the Samkhya system from the standpoint of the gunas, it might be useful to note how the concept of cit-sakti lies at the basis of Yogic practices. The agni which is ignited as a result of yogic practices, burns the body, constituted of seven dhatus. The Siddhas say that the yoga-deha is rare ; there is no limit to its strength. It is not injured by weapons, nor wetted by water ; it is not burnt in fire, nor it can be held fast in fetters. It is even more transparent than the sky. The method of how to achieve it through the union of prana and apana (See Ch. X) will have to be discussed later on. It should be noted for the present that through such a balance and harmony between contending, opposite tendencies, there springs an intense fire. This is known in Yogic terminology as Yogagni. This cin-maya fire burns up this body, made of seven dhatus ; and there appears for the first time an absolutely new cid-deha. This is the siddha-deha, referred to widely in the literature on Yoga. Diseases, old age and death cannot touch this body. Rasa-enjoyment is only possible through this cin-maya deha, and rasa-realisation is essentially the result of the operations of cit-sakti.

It is well-known that citta and prana are inter-related. Prana is the instrument by which the citta is to be conquered. Without the conquest of prana, there can be no siddhi in Yoga. The conquest of citta and its purification are synonymous, and go hand in hand. It has already been noticed that all vibhavas are the result of the activities of prana (See Ch. II), and as such indicate the play of sakti. Rasa flows when the prana is held in deep embrace by apana (See Ch. X), and there bursts out the flame of cid-agni. This is yogagni. This is the fire, which burns the dross in bhavas, and makes them pure gold in the form of rasas.

The cin-maya deha, being rooted in this prakṛita deha, it is necessary to find out the influences, which operate on the wordly plane. The influences to which everything in this world is subject, are the three gunas, sattva, rajas and tamas. This is the world of Prakṛiti, while the Purusa is absolutely untouched by the gunas. It has already been noticed in Ch. I. Sec. II, how the Prakṛiti in Samkhya

system, the storehouse of all energy and activities, was sought to be identified in popular religion, with the sakti in the form of visuddha-sattva in Ramanuja, Madhva, Nimbarka and Vallabha. This being so, it is important to analyse the concept of prakriti as being operated on by the three gunas.

The Vyasa-bhasya (III. 14) speaks of dharma as the sakti of the dharmi. It should be remembered that the Samkhya holds that the world is the result of the parinama of prakriti, just as the Vedanta holds that the world is the manifestation of the Sakti of Brahman. From this standpoint, prakriti and maya are functionally identical. This prakriti is the embodiment of Sakti, and is non-different from the Goddess Parvati. Maya centres round Brahman; maya manifests Him. So also Sakti is inseparably associated with Siva. Siva and Sakti unite together for the manifestation of the world. The evolution of nada into audible sound, and that sound itself becoming invested with meaning (See Ch. I), all these are the result of the play of Sakti. So also manifest world is the result of the evolution of Siva through sakti. This analogy led to the belief that every letter in Sanskrit vocabulary is a particular manifestation of this primeval Sakti. This concept lies at the root of the teachings of the Tantra, and is taken up for detailed discussion in Chapters IX and X.

The parinama-silata of the gunas in the Samkhya is the result of the play of sakti. The Samkhya speaks of upadana as a karya—potential (karya-saktimat) vastu. The upadeya is the result of the manifestation of sakti of the upadana. The Samkhya which recognises both samanya and visesa manifestation (See Ch. III), seeks to find a logical connection between the two. This connection has been found in the philosophy of sakti. The dharma and the dharmi are non-different, but they are not identical. The Samkhya recognises differentiation within an undifferentiated entity. That which brings about differentiation or parinama in the undifferentiated entity, is called Sakti, inherent in the prakriti itself.

The Samkhya-yoga of Patanjali speaks of parinama as the result of the sakti, inherent in prakriti. The ancient Samkhya literature similarly speaks of visuddha prakriti, as the storehouse of all manifestations. This concept of sakti as underlying all manifestations, has been the subject matter of detailed discussion in the sakti-vadin Vedanta of

Ramanuja, Nimbarka, Vallabha and Madhva. Aesthetic enjoyment being essentially the emergence of *sattva* from the potentiality of *sthayī-bhava*, it is a manifestation of *sakti*. This background of *Rasa* as the manifestation of *visuddha-sattva* (or the *sakti*) is taken up here for detailed investigation.

The concept of *sakti* as underlying all *parinama*, lies at the root of the speculations of the *Samkhya*. It should be noted further that this *parinama* as the manifestation of *Sakti* has also deeply coloured the speculations of the *Vedantists*, like Ramanuja, Madhva and Nimbarka. It is again, the same as the awakening of the *Kundalini* in the *Tantras*. *Bharata's Rasa* as manifestation of the *visuddha-sattva*, or *sakti* has to be read against this wider background of Indian philosophy.

The underlying idea of the *Yoga-bhasya* III. 14 is difficult to understand. If the epithet "*yogyata-bacchinna*"⁹² be taken to be a qualifying attribute of "*sakti*", then the sense of the whole sentence generally comes thus: the *dharma* is nothing but the power (*sakti*) of the *dharmin*, capable of giving rise to that effect only for which it is equipped with the necessary efficiency. *Vacaspati* attempts to bring out the significance of the said statement in two ways. Firstly, he states that the *dharma* is the power of the substance—the original matter, which constitutes the "earth", and the like. Here the "power" is to be regarded as the capacity of producing dust, lump of clay, jar and similar other aspects that exist in the earth—their material cause, in an undeveloped state. Let it be granted that they may evolve from the said substance. But how to account for the fact that a jar has the capacity of bringing water, while the original substance in the shape of earth has not got anything as such? This difficulty is removed by the epithet "*yogyata-bacchinna*." This means that the power itself that generates the jar and such other forms is equipped with the efficiency of bringing water and the like. Hence the capacity of bringing water is not to be regarded as incidental. This has been inherited by the jar from its material cause, along with the said power by which it becomes manifest to the objective world.

In his second interpretation, he takes the expression, "*yogyata-bacchinna*" in its plural form, and thus making it a qualifying adjective of "*dharminah*". By construing the sentence thus, he arrives at the following conclusion: the

dharmins or the principal materials are equipped with the necessary efficiency (yogyata-bacchinna dharminah); it is the power, which alone is to be regarded as the dharma (sakti-reva dharma). The power here is nothing but the "efficiency" already stated above. From this, it follows that "efficiency" only and nothing else is to be regarded as the dharma (yogyataiva dharma ityatha), and that which possesses this "efficiency" is said to be dharmin.

The Patanjala-Samkhya looks at prakriti as dharmin. Prakriti is self-propelled (swata parinaminee). Motion is inherent in it. Impulse does not come to it from outside. Though it is equipped with infinite potentiality, and has got a natural proneness towards actualisation, yet it cannot always function. There is an obstructing force that stands as a barrier towards its functioning and unless it be removed, it cannot act spontaneously. The efficient causes play their role here and render assistance to the prakriti. This has been beautifully described by way of illustration in the Yoga-Bhasya (IV. 3). Just as a farmer with a view to irrigating the corn-fields does not himself carry water from the reservoir to the fields, but makes an outlet in the embankment, and when this is done, water flows to the distant fields out of its own accord; so also the efficient causes in the shape of "virtue" and "vice" do not move prakriti into action; they simply remove the barrier, and when this is done, energy or sakti from the prakriti is automatically liberated. Just as the same farmer does not himself force the water into the roots of the plants, but only weeds out the field, and when this is finished, the roots of paddy plants can easily suck in earth and watery juice; so also the efficient cause such as "virtue" only removes "impurity" that stood as a barrier in the way of functioning of prakriti, and consequently helps to liberate the energy, stored up therein. Speaking briefly, prakriti is the sole agent. Activity is inherent in it. The efficient causes do not move it into action. They only help to remove the barrier. When the barrier is removed, there is an automatic liberation of energy, so long confined in the womb of prakriti.

Bharata's Rasa speculations, with very great emphasis on the concept of paka, are deeply indebted to the prakriti parinamavada of Patanjala Samkhya (See also Ch. VI). It should be remembered further that the emphasis on the philosophy of sakti (See also Ch. I) by Bharata made it possible for sakti-vadin Vedantists to offer an adequate and com-

prehensive philosophy of Rasa. The philosophy of sakti or visuddha-sattva thus underlies the prakriti-parinamavada of Bharata's Rasa analysis, or the Brahma-parinamavada of Ramanuja, Madhva, Vallabha and Nimbarka. The philosophy of sakti underlies all Rasa speculations.

The Vyasa-bhasya (II. 18) reads, "tulya-jatiya-tulya-sakti-bhedanu-patina pradhana-belayamupadarsita-sannidhana gunatve-pi ca vyapara-matrena pradhanantaraneetanumltastita"⁹³ It should be noted that the gunas, sattva, rajas and tamas are looked upon as sakti, and all manifestation, change and disappearance are due to them. The Vyasa-bhasya discusses further how certain saktis are tulya-jatiya, while certain others are atulya-jatiya. The infinite variety of bhavas (See also Ch. II for the Patanjala view of bhava) is due to the manifold manifestation of sattvika sakti, rajasa sakti, and tamasa sakti. The bhava whose constituent is always a particular kind of sakti, will by nature correspond to that sakti. This sakti in laukika bhavas is always a mixture of the three gunas, sattva, rajas and tamas (See Ch. II and Ch. XI). Rasa-enjoyment being always the manifestation of sattva, Rasa analysis is essentially an analysis of the sattvika sakti. This sattvika-sakti, it must be clearly understood, is essentially the same as visuddha-sattva. The nature of this sattvika sakti in relation to rajasa and tamasa saktis or gunas in the Samkhya system, is discussed in some detail in this section. An analysis of the gunas, and the parts played by them in the manifestation and evolution of the world, would not be out of place in a discussion of the nature of Rasa enjoyment.

The Samkhya system holds that no effect (or karya) is without its cause (or karana). The effect is already present in the cause ; the rasa is already there in the sthayi-bhava. There is only manifestation of the effect, latent in the cause. The karya is immanent as sakti in the karana ; the upadana in the upadeya. The Samkhya which believes in sat-karyavada, can never think of any uncaused effect. The sutras like "nasadut-pado nri-sringavad", "upadananyamat", "sarvatra sarvada sarva-asambhavad", "saktasya sakya-karanat",⁹⁴ attributed to Kapila, all speak of the impossibility of the creation of an entirely novel entity, not immanent in the cause itself. The cause becomes manifest into the effect only because of this inherent sakti. The two different kinds of karya, recognised by the Samkhya system, abhivyaajya-mana and utpadya-mana both presuppose the

presence of sakti. The evolution of the effect from the cause of the karya from the karana, of the upadeya from the bhava, all of them recognise the importance of sakti. From this standpoint, the asmita-rupa samanya of saritra and manasa rasa (See Ch. III) is of the nature of sakti, or upadana or karana of their visesa manifestation. The prakriti-parinamavada of the Samkhya, or the Brahma-parinama-vada of the Vedanta of Ramanuja, Madhva, Vallabha and Nimbarka, equally recognise sakti as underlying all parinama. The question has to be discussed with reference to both Patanjala-Samkhya, and Sakti-vadin Vedanta of Ramanuja, Madhva, Vallabha and Nimbarka.

Almost all great Alamkarikas are agreed that Rasa-enjoyment springs from an evocation of Sattva. The bliss of aesthetic enjoyment which has been very frequently compared to union with the Supreme Being, is only possible because of this emergence of Sattva. In Samkhya analysis, the three qualities, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas have been called the constituents of the universe. The Samkhya Karika explains these qualities as follows. Sattva is essentially light, and it reveals; Rajas is always on the move and is of a painful nature; and Tamas retards and shuts us in. The Samkhya analysis divides the material world into two: Bhuta (things) and indriya (senses). The Yoga-Sutra (II. 18) says, "bhuta-indriyatmakam. . . . drsyam"²⁵—visible world is made of things and sense. The bhutas are called Karya (existent things), and the senses are called Karana. The world is thus made of these two. It is important to realise that these three qualities interpenetrate both Karya and Karana. A Karya or a Karana is full of Sattva when it lights up and reveals the world. The Yukti-dipika (I. III. 13) says that a Karya is Sattvic, if it goes up. This going up by itself proves its lightness, and shows that it is charged with Sattva. If on the other hand, it is heavy and slow-moving, instead of going up, it comes down to earth. Sattva is light, as Tamas is heavy; and progression depends upon lightness, just as regression is the result of heaviness. The Gita refers to this dictum of the Samkhya, when it writes, ऊर्ध्वं गच्छन्ति सत्त्वस्थाः, अधो गच्छन्ति तामसाः। The ancient literature of the Hindus is full of this three-fold division of the cosmic world. The Vedas and popular Indian literature speak very frequently of the three worlds of "Bhu", "Bhuva" and "Svar". This last, the world of

"Svar" is full of Sattva ; it is always unfolding itself ; it is the abode of the Adityas. The heavens and the sky constitute the world of "bhuva" ; it is full of action. This world of "bhu" is predominantly Tamasic in nature. The dyo-loka is the head of a cosmic god, which touches the heavens, and whose feet are planted firmly in the world. His bosom and shoulders constitute, as it were, the antariksha-loka ; and feet are the bhuva-loka. In the human body similarly, the seat of the Sattva is in the head ; eyes and ears, which reveal the world of sense, are placed in the head. The head is the dyo-loka ; similarly the trunk of the body is the bhuva-loka ; it is full of action, and is situated in the middle portion of the human body. The lower portion of the human frame, his legs constitute the bhu-loka or the earth. The first glimmering of Sattva is felt through the eyes and the ears ; and these are all situated in the head. The bhuva-loka, which is always active, is presided over by the deity, Vayu. The regions beyond the navel upto the ends of the leg, is full of Tamas, and is dominated by Earth. Yaska in the Nirukta divides the visible world also into three parts, and admits that there are three deities presiding over these three parts, one for each. Yaska says that Agni presides over dyo-loka, Vayu over antariksha-loka, and Aditya over bhu-loka. These three qualities thus characterise all Karya or existent things.

If these three qualities characterise the visible world, they also characterise the senses or Karanas. Quick perception, exact apprehension, and capability of acting according to response are called in Samkhya terminology, "lightness" or felicity of faculties. The collection of mental images, the "abhimana" or possessiveness of Ahamkara, the perseverance of buddhi—all these are the works of Karana, charged with Sattva. Thus the lightness and revealing qualities of Sattva are manifested in both Karya and Karana.

Rajas characterises movement. This movement might take either of the two forms, (a) evolution or parinama, and (b) pulsation or parispanda. Evolution or parinama takes place when a thing loses its former self, by being worked upon by an attendant thing. Pulsation is also activity, the activity of the five pranas, as also of the five indriyas marked by asmita (vide p. 123). It should be noted that Tamas is heavy and shuts us in. This slowness of Tamas explains the going down of things (Karya) as also the lethargy

of the receiving senses (Karana). These three qualities on account of their difference, help manifest the diversification of these three gunas. The gunas being present both in grahaka and grahya, the grahaka or the perceptor will only perceive that guna, which is already dominant in him. The Samkhya-Karika (Sutras. 10, 11, 12) says that these three qualities give rise respectively to pleasure, pain and the clouding of senses. Sattva gives rise to pleasure ; Rajas contributes to pain ; and Tamas shuts us in. Sattva reveals ; Rajas activates ; and Tamas works against both. These three qualities are always working against one another ; they are always giving way to another. But they are always together and can never be separated from one another. If a man, with predominantly sattvic karanas (senses) takes in something, he appreciates the Sattvic elements of it ; he is delighted and well-pleased. So also a man predominantly Rajasic in character, can perceive only the Rajasic elements in sense-objects. He is incapable of taking in Sattvic elements, even when these are present. So also a man of Tamasic nature, can only appreciate the Tamasic elements or sorrowful elements in things of sense. He is blind to the Sattvic or Rajasic elements, which are equally present in it. These qualities are always struggling with one another. The rise of one guna marks the decline of the two others. It should be noted that conflicting gunas, when overcome, instead of being a hindrance, become a help. That is why these three gunas are ever inseparable, and always giving rise to others. Rajas and Tamas, when overcome, stimulate the growth of Sattva. But they destroy Sattva, unless they are overcome, and kept in check. In this way, in the predominance of one guna, the two other gunas, which are subordinated, contribute to its manifestation. So even when an action shows predominance of one guna, the two others are present in subordinated forms. Varsagana and other teachers of Samkhya hold, *स्पातिशयावृत्त्यतिशयाच्च परस्परं विरुद्धान्ते, सामान्यानि तु अतिशयैः सह प्रवर्तन्ते* (१७)— though giving rise to one another, their nature is circumscribed, and opposed to one another. Without forsaking their individual traits analysed above, these gunas contribute to the development of one another. In spite of their inherent opposition, these gunas can never be separated. They always go together. The teachers of Samkhya are fond of referring to the instance of the burning of a lamp, where we find the co-

ordination of the wick, the oil and the illumination. These three are naturally opposed to one another ; but a lamp burns for a long time by these being brought together. The illumination results from the destruction of the wick ; but the wick is not completely burned up, but preserved at the intervention of oil. The illumination is opposed once again to the oil ; but oil is used up little by little, and cannot be burnt all on a sudden at the intervention of the wick. In this way, though illumination, wick and oil are all opposed to one another, the illumination is made possible by the co-operation of these three. Thus Sattva, Rajas and Tamas inspite of their opposition, give rise to mahat by their mixing together. Mahat is self-revealing ; and so the constituent of mahat and such other things, is Sattva, pure and simple. But it should be remembered that in Sattvic activities, though there is the emergence of Sattva, the two other gunas are present in a subordinated form, and help in the promotion of Sattva. So the two other gunas, because of their subordination, help in the promotion of Sattva. But if either of these two gunas, Rajas and Tamas would have been dominant, then it would have worked against Sattva. If these three gunas had been equally dominant, then all activities should have stopped by their complete neutralisation. So there must be a disparity between these three gunas, so that there might be a Sattvic, Rajasic or Tamasic activity. The Samkhya concept of evolution holds that there can never be such a state where two or three gunas are equally stimulated. It is because of the bhoga (enjoyment) and apavarga (renunciation) of the purusa that gunas suffer a change. A state which does not contribute to the enjoyment or renunciation of the purusa, can never be reached—because such a state is of no use whatsoever. Prakriti suffers a change for the fulfilment of the ends of the purusa. A state can never be reached where there is only Sattva, contributing to the happiness of man. So also there can never be the exclusive play of Rajas or Tamas, contributing to sorrows and sufferings, or stupidity. No one guna can for long dominate the show ; for there are always the two others to undermine it. It explains why a man cannot be happy for long, as also why his rooted sorrow must necessarily be short-lived. The Patanjala-Yoga-Sutra (4.15) writes, चलंच गुणवृत्तम् —the gunas are always on the move, and are never stationary. All Karyas

or accomplished works are tinged with these three gunas ; for Karyas presuppose the play of these gunas. The constituents characterise the accomplished thing ; and a thing is Sattvic, Rajasic or Tamasic in nature on account of the predominance of any of these constituents. It explains why no one single thing can please all. It might please the majority of men ; but there will always be exceptions. A beautiful wife might be a source of great and intense pleasure to her husband. The Sattvic elements in her stimulate the elements of Sattva in her husband. But she at the same time, gives pain to the other co-wives of her husband. The other wives take in her Rajasic elements ; and so she becomes a source of envy and jealousy. This lady again, becomes a source of Tamas to those others, who find her inaccessible. Pleasure, disquiet and torpor are typical of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas respectively. The Samkhya analysis looks at everything of this world from the standpoint of these three conflicting gunas. The Vedas on the other hand, do not speak of three contending factors, but of two. The Vedas speak of two contending forces, which are at the foundation of everything in the world. The Vedas call these two opposite forces, Agni and Soma. Agni withers and destroys ; Soma waters and preserves. The Ayurveda recognises the opposition of three qualities as in Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, as also of two things, as in Agni and Soma. It appears that there is no inherent conflict between the positions held in the Veda and in the Samkhya. While the Veda emphasizes opposite things, the Samkhya emphasizes opposite qualities ; and things are constituted of qualities. Caraka takes over the Samkhya tenet that harmony or balance means the disappearance of conflicting gunas ; disequilibrium is at the root of all creation. Vata, pitta and Kapha when mutually balanced, are the source of health ; for health is nothing but equilibrium or Samata. A body is diseased when there is the dominance of any one of them.

The Samkhya divides all visible world into grahya and grahana. Grahyas are visayas, and grahanas are Indriyas. Sabdas are Jneya visaya, Vakyas are karya visaya, and Sariras are dharya visaya. On analysing sabda visaya, it shall be found that sabda Jnana is prakasa, vibration of sound is kriya, and the potential energy of vibration is sthiti. The kriya and prakasa are the result of the potential energy or sakti of vibration (Yoga-Sutra. II. 18).

This threefold division into prakasa, kriya and sthiti

characterises the *karanas* as well. The *sravanendriya* takes in sound as *ahara* (See Ch. II). The *jnana* or knowledge of sound is *prakasa-bhava*. The act of taking in of sound, or the nervous impulse, originating with the vibration from the physical world is its *kriya bhava*, and the energy stored in the nervous system and the muscles, which when activated, leads to *jnana*, is the *sthiti-bhava* of the ear-organ. So also, the tactile or muscular sense is the *karmendriya*, *pani* is its *prakasa-bhava*; its movements are its *kriya-bhava*, and the latent energy in the muscles of the hand, is its *sthiti-bhava*.

There is no *kriya* without *sakti*, and there is no *bodha* or cognition without *kriya*. The *bodha* or cognition is preceded by *kriya*; and *kriya* pre-supposes the existence of *sakti*. The *Samkhya* system in emphasizing the importance of *sakti*, holds that no *kriya* is uncaused. This has sometimes been called the *sat-karyavada*. Evolution is already latent in the cause; and the manifestation is only dependent on the play of *sakti*.

The *prakriti parinama-vada* of *Samkhya*, recognises *parinama* as the result of the operation of *sakti*, inherent in it. It should be clearly noted that in *Samkhya* analysis, *citta* is *jada*, and *cit-sakti* coming under the domain of *prakriti*, is *jada-sakti*. *Cit* being *jada*, the *parinama-silata* of *citta* is only an aspect of *prakriti-parinamavada* in *Samkhya*. But the same *cit* being *sakti-swarupa* in the *Vedanta*, it is *Brahma-parinamavada* in *Ramanuja*, *Madhva*, *Vallabha* and *Nimbarka*. The transition from the early speculations of *Bharata* to the later interpretation by *Abhinavagupta*, *Mammata*, *Viswanatha* is thus a shift from the *prakriti-parinamavada* of the *Samkhya* to the *Brahma-parinamavada* of the *Vedanta* and of *Saiva* and *Sakta* systems. This transition would have been rendered otherwise impossible, if all these systems had not equally recognised the importance of *cit-sakti* in *Rasa* enjoyment. The *Brahma-parinamavada* in *Visistadvaita*, and in *Saiva* and *Sakta* systems, thus offers an adequate background of the concept of *Rasa*.

The *prakriti-parinamavada* in *Yoga-sutra* and the *Vyasa-bhasya* pre-supposes the existence of *Sakti*. In *Yoga-sutra*. II. 3, it has been held that *karya-karana bhavas* like *avyakta-mahat-ahamkara* are the result of *parinama*. The *gunas* are always undergoing transformation (*parinama*) in the order of *mahat*, *ahamkara*, etc. In *Yoga-Bhasya*, II. 4,

it is held that klesas are lying in a dormant stage in a latent form as sakti in the citta. Prasupti is sthiti in a vija form. This is unmanifest sakti. The Vyasa-bhasya says that the state of samskara is pra-supti. Certain dormant or unnoticed samskaras may not come to fruition at present. But they will bear fruits in future. These are what is known, as prasupta klesa (II. 4). Bharata's sthayi-bhavas similarly are the result of evolution of praktani or idantantani vasanas, issuing from samskaras. The sthayi-bhava can thus be looked upon as stored-up energy, or prasupta klesa. Rasa realisation is essentially a liberation of the stored-up energy in sthayibhava. This process of liberation is always accompanied with the play and manifestation of sakti. The process itself is essentially a clarification, or purification where the dross of sthayi-bhava is transformed into rasa of aesthetic enjoyment (See also Chs. IX, X and XI).

The Vyasa-bhasya II. 4 explains prasupti as "cetasi sakti-matra-pratisthanam vija-bhavo-pagama".⁹ It should be noted further that the Vyasa-bhasya finds points of affinity as also difference between prasupta klesa and dagdha-vija-kalpa klesa. While prasupta klesa flowers forth or becomes udara, the moment it is provided with an alambana, dagdha-vija-kalpa-klesa even when provided with an alambana cannot manifest itself. Bharata's repeated references to Rasa enjoyment as very similar to the enjoyment of curry, formed out of different ingredients, shows this awareness of the philosophy of sakti. It appears that the reference to sthayi-bhava as vija in Ch. 6. sloka. 38 (Banaras ed.) by Bharata is no accident, but is an echo of Patanjala analysis of prasupta samskara as sakti-matra in the form of vija (Vyasa-bhasya. II. 4). It should be remembered further that Bharata's sthayi-bhava (springing from vasana) issues out of klista samskara ; this klista samskara again springs from sa-vija (vyuthana) samskara. There is throughout a manifestation of sakti from its beginning in sa-vija samskara to its culmination in vasana, leading to Rasa enjoyment (bhoga). (Vyasa-bhasya. II. 12). Bharata's awareness of this sakti-swarupata of vasana and sthayi-bhava is confirmed further by his reference to visuddha sattva, immediately before sloka 93 in Ch. VII of the Natya-sastra (Banaras ed.). The sakti-rupata of visuddha-sattva, as the core of Rasa enjoyment has to be examined in detail in this and the following chapter.

II

In Rasa-enjoyment, there is the emergence of Sattva. Bharata in Ch. VII of the *Natya-sastra*, discusses how Sattvika-bhavas always go with the enjoyment of Rasa. From the foregoing analysis, it appears that at the moment of Rasa-enjoyment, Sattva is partly dissociated from Rajas and Tamas. It has already been noticed that Sattva can never be completely dissociated from these two, so that it is important to note that Rasa-enjoyment is always of the *aprakṛita viśuddha-sattva*. The question naturally arises how there is the emergence of Sattva through the reading of poetry and drama ; this emergence of Sattva is Rasa-realisation.

The ancient writers have prescribed the use of powdered nirmali fruit for the removal of the turbidity of water during the rains. The thick juice of nirmali fruit, like the paste of sandalwood on first coming in contact with water, makes it even more turbid. But within a short time, the nirmali paste spreads out in countless threads, and reaches every corner of the vessel. This nirmali paste is of a slippery nature ; and the turbidity of the water is gradually removed by this slippery paste. The spreading out of nirmali paste in countless threads, is due to what in the *Ayurveda*, has been called, the quality of सर. This quality is very prominent in poisons and liquors. If a man is poisoned in one part, his system is immediately affected. So also on even drinking a little wine, a man shows signs of unbalance. The reading of poems and plays thus spreads rapidly throughout the mind of the reader. There is no unclean corner of the human mind which is not affected with the reading of poems and plays. A fuller discussion of the process of this removal will be made in Ch. VIII. But it should be remembered that with the removal of impurities, human mind (*citta*) becomes the transparent mirror in which *atman* (soul) which is *ananda* (bliss) incarnate, is reflected. This is the stage of Rasa-enjoyment. Bliss subsists so long as the soul is pure. But a man with an impure soul is not in a position to enjoy such bliss. The man with a purified soul, is a detached spectator. But a man whose soul is impure with Rajas and Tamas, can never be detached. The Yogi attains this state of purification through disinterested service to the country ; the worldly

wise man can be purified for a time as a result of reading poems and plays. The man with a purified soul, because of this detachment, feels excess of delight, which is impossible through sensuous gratification. This excess of delight is to be had only when the soul is free from impurities. At this stage, the soul is detached, disinterested, and free from all kinds of directed pleasure.

III

The Mahabhasya means by Sattva, a substance, or dravya. The doctrine of action-passion in Aristotelian analysis is very similar to the doctrine of tāpya-tāpaka, as developed in the Mahabhasya. It is to be noted further that the material thing which is being acted upon (tāpya) is Sattva, while the passions (tāpaka) are either Rajas or Tamas (Vyasa-Bhasya. II. 17). Absolute purification is unattainable in this world. The Upanishads say that to be without gunas, meaning Rajas or Tamas, is to become absolutely purified. So rare is this absolutely purified Sattva, that it has been called the character of Brahma ; तत्सोपाधिः प्रकृतः सत्त्वः । (Yoga-sutra).⁹⁸ Early Samkhya teachers looked at Sattva as a substance. In the different stages of Samkhya, we find the concept of Visuddha-prakriti. Visuddha-prakriti and visuddha-Sattva are not essentially different, in as much as Sattva in early Samkhya analysis, being of a substantial nature, is close to the concept of prakriti.

This concept of Sattva in early Samkhya analysis has evolved through various stages of development. The greatest achievement of Samkhya seems to be the recognition of one principle, which has evolved through different stages of development, and gone into the making of this manifold universe. The Samkhya teachers are broadly classified into four groups, (a) Kala-vadin, (b) Parinama-vadin, (c) Iswara-vadin, and (d) Swabhava-vadin. It should be clearly understood that in all four branches, one unifying principle, one primordial element is recognised as the mother of all creation. The Samkhya explains the creation of this universe by the principle known as समन्वयात् । In the Bhamati, Vacaspati Mishra explains what is meant by this principle. Vacaspati writes,

यानि च येन रूपेण आ स्थौल्यात् आ च सौम्यात् समन्वीयन्ते तानि तदात्मक सामान्यपूर्वकानि लोके दृष्टानि । यदा मृदात्मसामान्यतया समन्विता घटादयो विकारा मृत्सामान्योपादनका लोके प्रसिद्धा । (99)

Vacaspati means by this that existent things (Karya-vastu) in palpable or intelligible forms, or in any condition, appear before us all the time charged with a universal trait which persists all through these changes; that universal form is the constituent of everything. A thing can never be divorced from its constituent; and that constituent which enters into the making of everything, is known as the universal element.

In their search for such a universal principle, the Samkhya teachers singled out at different stages of development different principles. The Iswar-vadin branch of Samkhya, as developed by Patanjali in Yoga-Sutra, looks at prakriti as such a universal principle. The Vyasa-Bhasya writes that out of buddhi or linga-matra, have evolved ahamkara and the five tan-matras, or these six avisesa. Eleven indriyas have evolved out of this ahamkara, as also the five tan-matras. Out of the five universal primary elements (panca-mahabhuta) have evolved five elements or visesa. Prakriti represents the ultimate constituent of the universe. Through gradual refinement and more comprehensiveness, we travel from sense to intellectual apprehension of this essence of things. The Samkhya calls this prakriti the nascent form of universe. It can be anything, and is everything; it can be transformed into every shape and form. Prakriti extends everywhere. It is beyond the comprehension of common man how one principle in all its diverse manifestations, has been the material cause of this universe. The Samkhya teachers who had such a comprehensive view of Prakriti, have been called Brahma-vadin or Iswara-vadin. Clay when imposed with a form, becomes either a pot or a jar. But clay as such, is not intelligible to sense. This Samkhya analysis of particular and universal is not very different from the Aristotelian concept of matter and form. Clay as such is less intelligible than a clay pot; or a clay jar. So also gandha (smell) which characterises earth, is far less tangible than clay as such. Again, the constituent of gandha as such, ahamkara or buddhi is far more refined than gandha-tanmatra; and prakriti out of which buddhi evolves, is the most refined of all. Refinement with comprehensiveness has reached its acme in prakriti. In this way,

according to Samkhya analysis, all jada-varga (which comprehends all visible world) culminates in an all pervasive, absolutely unintelligible world. It should be noted that the purusa in Samkhya analysis, is beyond the activities of this prakriti, though it is for the bhoga and apavarga of purusa that the prakriti evolves. This mundane world is charged with three qualities. These are pleasure, pain and stupor, symbolised in Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. The world came into being, because of the interplay of these three gunas. When the gunas are unbalanced, there is the creation of the world. When the gunas reach a balance and perfect harmony, there is an end to all activities. All the gunas cannot be equally stimulated at the same time. The unequal development of gunas is at the root of all creations. Sattva predominates in all Sattvic activities. All activities in Samkhya, are analysed from the standpoint of these three gunas. Unbalance of gunas leads to creation; balance and harmony leads to effacement. It is usual for the gunas either to reach a balance or be thrown out of it. The Ayurveda has taken over this basic principle of Samkhya—that balance leads to cure or effacement of diseases; unbalance of three principles, vata, pitta and kapha gives rise to different diseases. The creation of disease and creation of this world of sense follow the same pattern and principle.

The Swabhava-vadin Samkhya teachers recognise two parinamas of the prakriti. This prakriti is always undergoing changes. One is sadrsa parinama; the other is visadrsa parinama. The Vyasa-bhasya says that with sadrsa parinama, there is an end to all creation, just as with visadrsa parinama, there is the evolution of the world. Both these parinamas are self-originated. This view appears at the first instance to be contrary to reason. Prakriti is unconscious; and an unconscious entity is not expected after all to work for an end which it itself does not understand. This urge to activity on the part of an unconscious entity for the sake of a conscious one has been explained in the Karika by the simile of the cow and the milk it produces. (Ka. 57). Just as milk in the cow is secreted for the nourishment of the calf, similarly the unconscious prakriti also functions for the purpose of purusa. The problem has also received the attention of the followers of Varsaganya (Yukti-dipika, p. 170, ff.). It is like the excitement of the physical body of a male for union

with the female. This is drifting towards the theory of spontaneous origin of the universe.

The Samkhya which underlies aesthetic speculations, seems to have been deeply influenced by Kāla-vadin teachers. The Kāla-vadin teachers also draw their support from the sutra, अन्वयात् । If all things are ultimately to be traced back to one principle, as it is Iswara with the Iswarabadins, or parinama with the Parinama-vadins, it can as well be Kāla. The champions of Kāla are of opinion that everything exists in Kāla, and Kāla enters into the making of everything. The perception of a thing is not possible, if it is not fixed in Kāla. The Kāla-karanikas hold, नमोऽस्ति प्रत्यया लोके यत्र कालो न भासते, there can be no knowledge without reference to time. The position of the Kāla-karanikas is defended, like the positions of Swabhava-vadins and Parinama-vadins ; and all derive their authority from the Sutra, अन्वयात् । Similarly, there is another school of thought, which recognises Sabda as the fundamental principle of the universe. The logic which helped establish prakriti as the fundamental principle of the universe, has been equally effectively used by the Kāla-karanikas in establishing Kāla (time) and Sabda-dvaitavadins in establishing Sabda as the constituent of the universe. So also the Buddhists have championed Vijnana, and the advaita-vadins Brahma as the one underlying principle of this changing world. It shows the very great importance of the Samkhya doctrine, अन्वयात् ।

The Alamkarikas, particularly Bharata, seem to follow both the Kāla-vadin, and Iswara-vadin traditions of Samkhya. Bharata's indebtedness to Iswara-vadin branch of Samkhya is very apparent, inasmuch as he seems to belong to the tradition of Patanjali. His indebtedness to Kālavadin branch is less apparent. Caraka though he belongs to Iswara-vadin branch of Samkhya, does not deny the very great importance of Kāla in the study of health and disease. In Sutra-Sthanam, Ch. 6. 2-6, Caraka discusses the change that comes over the world in course of the different seasons. In Sarira-Sthanam, I. 33-34, Caraka discusses the question once again, Susruta also writes : रससम्पत्तव्यापत्तिः कालायत्तः ।⁽¹⁰⁰⁾ In Sutra-Sthanam. 6.7, Caraka refers to "mahendra-utsava", which is usually held at the beginning of autumn. He is of opinion that diseases and their cure are rooted in time (Sutra-Sthanam. 6. 4-5).

Bharata's Rasa-speculations are undoubtedly influenced by the Iswara-vadin speculations of Patanjali. But it seems that Bharata is prepared to accept "time" also as an important factor in the evolution of Rasa. This will be clear when it is remembered that Bharata traces the origin of drama from this same Mahendra-vijaya (Natyasastra. Banaras ed. I. 56). In Ch. 27 on Siddhi-vyanjaka, Bharata discusses at length the part played by Kala in successful stage performances. In Slokas 85-95, time is considered as an essential element in the successful evocation of sentiments. For instance in Sloka 91, Bharata says that songs depleting Sringara-Rasas are to be played at evening. In Sloka 92, Bharata says tearful songs are to be played in the morning. Bharata says in Sloka 94, that plays should never be staged without taking into consideration appropriateness of time and place. The great importance of time is recognised once again in the analysis of uddipana vibhava as moon-lit night, soft blowing wind at evening contributing to the evolution of Sringara-Rasa.

IV

This evolution and involution or in other words, emergence and absorption have a terminus—one in the descending order and the other in the ascending order. Involution culminates in prakriti; while evolution through gradual progression, almost reaches the ultimate cause. But evolution according to Samkhya is the gradual development of what existed inherently within the primary cause in a diffused state. It is the process which makes the underdeveloped or less developed one more developed, the integrated or the less differentiated one more differentiated. The author of the Yoga-bhāṣya clearly brings home its significance by the expression

तत्र तत् संसृष्टं विविच्यते क्रमानतिवृत्तेः । (101)

(II. 9). The whole process is confined within the primary cause itself; it cannot overstep it. That which evolves stays within the cause. It is not detached from what gives rise to it. It is immanent therein. Still it is differentiated from the cause as its effect. It is nourished and brought upto its

fullest extent —विवृद्धिकाटामनुभवन्ति । (102) —(Yoga-bhasya. II. 19).—therein by following a definite order of sequence which cannot be violated. Vacaspati is found to elucidate the point in his commentary by way of illustration. He says that the seed of the banyan tree does not bring out all on a sudden the full-grown tree, with its thick foliage, capable of protecting us from the scorching rays of the sun. The tree comes out gradually, because it was already latent in the seed. The root, stem, leaves and branches come out gradually in an ordered sequence, brought about by contact of the seed with earth, water and heat and other accessories. Similarly the evolutes do not appear suddenly. They follow a definite order of succession.

Bharata's Rasa-analysis strictly follows this Samkhya concept of evolution and involution. According to Patanjala analysis, the manas is of the nature of a substance, much as psyche in early Aristotelian analysis is a substance. Susruta calls manas उभयात्मकः । (Sutra-sthanam. 1. 4). The end of involution or absorption is reached when the Rajas and Tamas, which stand in the way of Rasa-enjoyment, are absorbed together with the requisite amount of Sattva in the substance of the manas. This is one terminus of the Samkhya concept as applied to Bharata's analysis. This substance of the manas which has swallowed up the Rajas and Tamas, represents one stage in the evolution in Samkhya analysis. This evolution of prakriti is always through the union of opposites. This applies equally to the analysis of soul in the Upanishads, as also to the analysis of Samkhya. The five koshas recognised by the Upanishads, are anna-maya, prana-maya, mano-maya, vijanna-maya, and ananda-maya. Bharata's Rasa-analysis begins with indriya-indriyārtha-samyoga. At the initial stage of this samyoga, the prana-maya kosha is fed with whatever the different indriyas bring in to it. It should be carefully noted that the Upanishads look at the working of different senses as manifestations of the prana-maya kosha. The Chandogya-Upanishad (5. 1. 15) writes,

न वै वाचो न चक्षुंसि न मनासीत्याक्षते प्राणा इत्येवाचक्षते प्राणो ह्येवैतानि सर्वानि भवन्ति । (103)

"Men do not speak of a sense of speech, or faculty of sight, or of hearing, or of meditation, but speak of a group of pranas, which does all these. For these are all manifes-

tations of prana". All these sense-faculties are thus seated in the prana. It has already been noted in Ch. II, how heart in controlling the streams of prana-vaha srota (Caraka. Vimana. Ch. 5.4) is thereby controlling the different senses.

In the process of evolution, beginning with prana, or sense-knowledge (with which all are immediately concerned in aesthetic appreciation), there is a synthesis of opposites. The proper sphere of the activity of prana is confined to the vibhava stage. It has been noted in the analysis of vibhava in Ch. II, that all informations gathered by prana, are forms of ahara. Bharata's imagery of the process of cooking in describing Rasa-evolution in Ch. 6 is not merely analogical, as it has been very often supposed. It is ahara, because the vibhavas are to be taken in through the senses, and whatever is taken in through the senses, is ahara. The analogy of cooking is very appropriate, because it is the process of purification of bhava from the play of Rajas and Tamas, so that we may reach the Rasa-stage.

Bharata's Rasa-analysis thus begins with the prana-maya stage. From prana-maya kosha, the soul (following the Samkhya analysis) passes on to the mano-maya stage. While prana-maya kosha is strictly confined to the Vibhava stage, at the mano-maya kosha, the process of Rasa-realisation has already begun. This further explains how it is that Rasa-realisation is of one, who is सुमनः। The manas is characterised by two gunas, Samkaipa (determination) and Vikalpa (doubts). The essence of Rasa-realisation according to Bhatta Sankuka is the mastering of doubts, arising out of anumana, by strong determination. Samkaipa (determination) is ever opposed to Vikalpa (doubts), so that the passage to the next higher stage of Vijnana-maya kosha is achieved once again through the synthesis of these two opposites. At the Vijnana-maya stage, the soul is once again cleft into two. These are anukui (favourable) and pratikui (unfavourable) cognition, and the mastering of pratikui by anukui, and the consequent purification, characterises the Vijnana-maya stage.

Prakriti is the fundamental substance out of which the world evolves. In the unmanifested condition, prakriti is something where all opposites are held in abeyance. When they are all held together in a state of equilibrium (samya-vastha), there is no action. The state of rest is said to be

the natural condition of prakṛiti (Yoga-Bhāṣya. II. 18). Yet the absence of outer activity does not mean the absence of any tendency to act. The tendencies to manifestations (Sattva) and activity (Rajas) are held in check by the tendency to non-manifestation and non-activity (tamas). The Sāṃkhya conceived the supreme principle of the world as a unity with a real opposition of element. An abstract unit can be either perpetually active or perpetually inactive. When there is a disturbance of the equilibrium of the guṇas, we have the destruction of prakṛiti (prakṛitināśa), the relieving of the tension by the overweighting of one side, and the setting in of the process of becoming. Prakṛiti evolves under the influence of puruṣa. The fulfilment of the ends of puruṣa is the cause of the manifestation of prakṛiti in the three specialised states. Since prakṛiti is one and ubiquitous, all things have prakṛiti for their basis, and in a sense, everything shares the characters of everything else. In Rāsa-analysis, the mano-māya stage is expected to play the part of śakti with reference to particular Rāsas. The passage from bhava to rāsa, leading to the emergence of sattva, free from the turbidity and disquiet of passions, must then begin with the mano-māya stage. For Bharata is emphatic that Rāsa-enjoyment is of the su-manāsa, who is also a prekṣaka.

In the analysis of sensations in Ch. II it was found how manas acting through the indriyas seated in hrdaya, gathers all sense-impressions. Manas uses Vāyu as its instrument. This is very appropriate, for Vāyu according to Sūśruta, shares the qualities of Sattva. The disquiet of passions in the manomāya stage is the result of the presence of both Saṃkalpa and Vikalpa. In Yoga-Bhāṣya (I. 9) the nature of Vikalpa has been analysed. Vikalpa has been defined as शब्दज्ञानानुपाती वस्तुमूल्यो विकल्पः ।⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ The Vyāsa-Bhāṣya analyses Vikalpa into three parts—vastu vikalpa, kriyā vikalpa and abhava vikalpa. When the same thing is said in two forms, then Vikalpa accounts for the difference. Thought or contemplation cannot be perfectly true, unless it is freed or purgated from vikalpa. The ascetics in their samādhi come to know the ins and outs of things through this just knowledge or prajña. Prajña which is ऋतम्भरा, is opposed to all forms of Vikalpa. It thus appears that Prajña is reached through the suppression of vikalpa, which is rooted in the manas.

Just as Vikalpa stands in the way of complete understanding by the manas, and has to be overcome by Samkalpa, so there are favourable (anukul) and unfavourable (pratikul) cognitions of the buddhi. The soul is held in bondage, so long as it does not look beyond both these cognitions. Vidya and avidya, being rooted in buddhi, are the causes of liberation and bondage. When buddhi achieves this vidya or anukul cognition, then the purusa becomes separated. But even when purusa is separated, it is unchanged. At the moment of union with purusa, the buddhi appears to be of the same nature with it. At the moment of separation, the purusa exists by itself. Such cognition of the separate existence of the purusa is also seated in the buddhi. The vidya or anukul cognition of the buddhi is to know that the purusa exists by itself, alone, ubiquitous, untrammelled by any other thing.

V

This gradual separation of the purusa from prakriti is purification, which the Samkhya teachers are never tired of expounding. In aesthetic speculations, it assumes the form of detached enjoyment of the appreciator or bhokta. The art-experiencer enjoys the work of art, but he is not engrossed or held by it. In Yoga-sutra, I. 19, we have भवप्रतयो विदेहप्रकृतिलयानाम् । (105) The word “भव” has been variously interpreted. Vacaspati Misra explains “भव” as avidya; Bhojaraja explains “भव” as samsara. Vijnana-bhikshu means by it the cycle of birth. The Buddhists speak of “भवपञ्चा जाति” or the determining cause of birth is bhava. Similarly in Bharata's Rasa-analysis, the determining cause of the evolution of Rasa, is bhava. There is a good deal of evidence to show that Bharata's analysis of Rasa-evolution follows the Samkhya concept of evolution, as also the analysis of suddha-sattva in Ramanuja, Nimbarka, and Madhva.

It should be clearly recognised that Bharata always speaks of the association of sattva with the evolution of Rasa. The different Rasas are only the manifestations of

sattva in different forms. In Ch. 7 in the portion following Sloka 92 (Banaras ed.), Bharata writes,

तच्च समाहितमनस्त्वात् उत्पद्यते । मनःसमाधानाच्च सत्त्वनिवृत्तिर्भवति ।
.....अत्रोच्यते इह हि नात्यधर्मप्रवृत्तः सुखदुःखकृतो भाव
तथासत्त्वविशुद्धाधिष्ठितः कार्यो यथास्वरूपो भवति । (106)

The sattva is purified, when the mind is self-controlled. The bhava, giving rise to pleasure and pain, is rooted in the purified sattva. This concept of visuddha sattva has been the subject of detailed discussion in the advaita-vadin analysis of Pancaratra, Valkhanasa, Ramanuja, Nimbarka as well as Madhva.

In the Samkhya analysis, Sattva corresponds to matter or dravya. Rajas and Tamas cannot exist separately from Sattva. They depend on Sattva for their existence. The relation of Sattva to Rajas or Tamas is thus what it is between tapya and tāpaka. Tapya is matter; and tāpaka approximates to the Aristotelian form. Tapya is the substrate; tāpaka are its qualities. Tāpaka differentiates the as yet undifferentiated and unformed matter into definite forms and shapes. Sringara or Hasa, with their different admixture of Tamas or Rajas are thus manifestations of the samanya rasa (See Ch. III).

Caraka in analysing the activation of the Avyakta in Sarira, I. 18-19, writes,

अव्यक्ताद्रव्यकृतां याति व्यक्तादव्यक्ततां पुनः ।

रजस्तमोभ्यामाविष्टश्चक्रवत् परिवर्तते ॥ (107)

Rajas is the activating agent of the prakriti or avyakta. Being acted upon by Rajas, the avyakta becomes vyakta, or the unmanifest becomes manifest. With the cessation of the work of Sattva, the Being once again relapses into non-being. Caraka looks at manas as such an activating agent. In Sarira. I. 20, Caraka writes,

अचेतनं क्रियावच्च मनश्चेतयिता परः ।

युक्तस्य मनसा तस्य निर्दिश्यन्ते विभोः क्रियाः ॥

चेतनावान् यतश्चात्मा ततः कर्चा निरुच्यते ।

अचेतनत्वाच्च मनः क्रियावदपि नोच्यते ॥ (108)

In Susruta, this manas is both a substance and energy. In Sarira. I. 4, Susruta writes उभयात्मकं मनः । Mind or Sattva is the bridge which connects pure energy which is

sect, are the cit, the a-cit and Iswara. Of these three, Iswara is the principal or angī, the two others being his attributes or anga. Iswara is always qualified by cit and a-cit. This cit and a-cit at the moment of creation, are sthūla or gross; at the moment of destruction, these become suksma or of a subtle nature. The cit is atman, distinct from the body, self-revealing, of the nature of ananda, or naturally well-disposed, eternal, unmanifest or beyond the reach of the senses, unthinkable (a-cintya), always of the same nature, and without any change. The atman, even though it is of the nature of jñāna, is the reservoir of all jñāna; it is the jñāta or the Omniscient. It is yet controlled by Iswara, and is only limited by Him, and is His own self. Even though it is atomic, the knowledge of the atman is all-pervasive; so there is no hindrance to its enjoyment. Kriya and bhoga being only varieties of jñāna or knowledge, the atman is the kartā and the bhoktā, the moment it becomes jñāta. But the activity of the jīva is essentially dependent on Iswara. The kriya or the activity of the jīva, if it were to evolve out of the stage of jñāna, must first be permitted by Iswara. The primary swatantra-sakti of the jīva is granted to him by God. So his freedom is also controlled by Him. The highest realisation of the jīva lies in this swatantra sakti. The swatantra sakti is best manifest when he serves Him best.

The followers of Ramanuja recognise three different kinds of jada padārtha. These are suddha-sattva, misra-sattva, and kāla. There is no trace of rajas and tamas in the suddha-sattva. This explains how it is the source of all knowledge and delight, and is ever pure. This sattva at the wish of the Lord, gets transformed and assumes the form and shape of all things in the abode of eternal bliss. The Vaikuntha dhama, the arches and the portals of this heaven, the bodies of all nitya-mukta jīvas and even of the Lord Himself, are made up of this pure material, the visuddha-sattva.

While prakṛiti has the three qualities of Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, Suddhasattva has only Sattva. When creation takes place on account of the will of the Lord, subtle matter becomes gross and souls enter into connection with material bodies, corresponding to the degree of merit or demerit acquired by them in previous forms of existence. This mediation between soul and material bodies is effected by Lakshmi, who is of the nature of Suddha-sattva. Sree or

Lakshmi is the connecting link between the realms of Iswara and the mundane world of jiva. This is done out of love and affection. Lakshmi is compassionate, and is always looking after our well-being. She is "Karunagra-nata mukhi"; she has been called "Karunam Vedantaram", in Asta-uttara-sahasranama. She is in the realm of Iswara; yet her gaze is fixed on the sufferings of her sons, the unemancipated men of this world. She is trying to direct the men of this world to God, by her love and compassion. She being Brahma-vidya incarnate, is removing the darkness of ajana. She is protecting man from the snares of maya. Once again, she being one with Visnu, is trying to win the favour of Parameswara for jivas. She asks Him to be compassionate to poor suffering creatures. The cherished aim of Vaisnava faith has always been to enjoy Brahmananda as mukta-jivas. They have always emphasized that their ideal is to enjoy this ananda or bliss in mortal bodies, and not to be lost in perfect identification with Him. Their creed has been to "taste sweet, but not to be turned into sweetness itself, when enjoyment will cease". The dependence on Lakshmi thus became the cardinal point in Vaisnava religious faith.

Ramanuja at the beginning of "Gadya-traya" seeks the help of Lakshmi in propitiating Lord Narayana. Venkatanatha in his Commentary on this Gadyatraya writes, the reason why men seek the help of Lakshmi is that "She will help men cross the sea of gunas quickly and at ease". This Lakshmi is yajna-vidya, maha-vidya, guhya-vidya and atma-vidya. Sree is the giver of knowledge and liberation. Visnu can never be without Lakshmi, just as Lakshmi can never be without the Lord. They are dependent on each other on account of the perfect harmony reached between the two.

तदेतत् सूक्ष्ममिधुनं परम्परविचिहितम् ।

आदावन्योन्य मिश्रत्वादन्योन्य प्रतिपादकम् ॥

(cited in Venkata-bhasya)

The goddess of Ramanuja with all her beauty, qualities, excellence and wealth, is the ideal wife of Visnu. Ramya-Yamatree discusses in "Tattva-dipa" where to place Lakshmi in the hierarchy of being. He places Her in the category of Jivas, because of Her atomic nature (cited in Venkata-bhasya). But later Vaisnavas do not subscribe to this atomic nature of Lakshmi. Like Visnu, she is also of the nature of God. She being endowed with consciousness, is

different from unconscious matter, or aëth. On account of her pervasiveness, she is again different from the jīva. The diverse manifestation of Oneself in the form of the Universe, and the withdrawal of this manifested appearance into Himself once again—this is what is known as līla. There had been little attempt up to the time of Ramanuja to find any connection between this līla and Swarupa-bhūta Śakti. Viṣṇu manifests Himself in both bhoga and līla. The Śrēe sect developed this concept of līla centering round Lakṣmī. This līla manifests itself in the forms of different Rasas and bhavas. It is mṛgdha-līla as well as vīdagdha-līla. It is the līla of the Supreme Lord, by which He looks at His dearest wife. This līla centres round Lakṣmī. She is of the nature of Viśuddha-sattva, so that Rasas and bhavas become the manifestation of the purified sattva of Śrēe. Yamunachāryya in "Śrēe-stotra-ratna", 44 writes,

अपूर्वनानारसभावनिर्भय—

प्रबुद्धया मुग्धविदाधलीलया ।

क्षणाणुयत् क्षिप्तपयादिकालया

प्रहर्षयन्तं महिषीं महामुजम् ॥ (113)

There is no good discussion available of the nitya-līla of Rasa Brahma. There is again no good analysis of the puṣṭi-bhakti of the Vallabhiya sect, or bhakti mixed with raga of the Gaudiya sect, or bhakti mixed with prema of other sects. The raga bhakti has flown through diverse channels. The mahasukhavada doctrine of the Buddhist Vajrayana (See Ch. X), or the doctrines of the Sahaja-yana and the Baul Sampradaya about the nature of Rasa, or the Rasa-sadhana of the Kaula Sampradaya (See Ch. IX) are all different ramifications of this raga bhakti. The Tantric siddhachāryyas of the middle ages contributed in no small measure to the development of the doctrine of Rasa. The doctrine of Rasa has been developed in different directions for more than a thousand years; and all the provinces of India, irrespective of geographical frontiers, have taken a part in it.

The nitya-brindaban, or the Valkuntha, which occupies such a prominent place in the speculations of the different Vaisnava sects, is only the result of the manifestation of the infinite śakti of Bhagavan. The infinite śakti of Bhagavan leads to infinite bhavas. His līla and His dhama are all end-

less and infinite. The lila itself is infinitely diversified. The Srutis speak of the divine city of Ayodhya—"devanam poorayodhya". They also sometimes speak of "eternal Jerusalem" in the West¹. The truth seems to be that one must get rid of abhimana or attachment to physical body (prakrita deha) in order to get a glimpse of this noumenal world. This noumenal world, placed far above the prakriti charged with the three gunas, is known in Samkhya as the "prakrita kala". The parinama due to kâla (kâla pacati bhutâni)² is held in check. The visuddha-sattva is the constituent of this nitya-dhama. It undergoes no parinama due to the influence of kâla. It can undergo parinama only at the wish of Iswara, working for the fulfilment of the wishes of the devotee, or at the wish of the devotee, working for the fulfilment of the wishes of the Lord, or due to the sheer playfulness (lilâ) of the Mahasakti.

There is a deep core of truth in Bharata's demand that Rasa realisation is only for the sumanassa preksaka. The ultimate reality manifests itself at its own sweet will. Svecchyaya sva-bhittan viswamunmeelayati. He enjoys; He Himself is being enjoyed. He is the upadana; He is the nimitta. He is the upadeya. He does not depend on a second for subsistence. The spectator and the actor are one and the same. The spectator again is no passive spectator. Bharata's demand that the spectator must at once be sumanassa and preksaka is only intelligible when it is remembered that both are manifestations of the visuddha-sattva.

This concept of visuddha-sattva has again been worked out at great length in the Pancaratra. The first phase of the manifestation of Lakshmi is called Suddha-sristi, "pure creation" or gunonmesadasa, that is the stage (following the waveless stage) in which the attributes (gunas) of God make their appearance. These gunas are aprakrita, "not belonging to Nature" for Nature does not exist as yet—and have consequently nothing to do with the three well-known Gunas (Sattva, Rajas and Tamas); that is to say; the old dogma that God is necessarily "free from (the three gunas)", i.e. nirguna, does not exclude His possessing the six ideal Gunas, which, on the contrary must be ascribed to Him, because without them there could be no Pure Creation, and

¹ Romans, V. 18 21; Romans, VI. 9 11.

² Bharata has probably this paka in mind, when he compares Rasa-realisation with the preparation of soups and drinks.

all further evolution depending thereon, no creation at all. However, the evolution of the Gunas does not in any way affect the being or essence of God, it being merely concerned with His "becoming" or "manifestation", that is : His Sakti : "Through the three pairs of what are called the Six Gunas (Sadguna) ; the six Gunas are jnana, aisvarya, sakti, bala, virya, and tejas."

The six Gunas are the material, or instruments, as it were, of Pure Creation, (1) in their totality, and (2) by pairs, in the following way : The Gunas as connected partly with the Bhuti and partly with the Kriya sakti are regarded as falling into two sets, namely Gunas 1 to 3, and Gunas 4 to 6, called respectively "visrama-bhumayah" or "stages of rest" and "srama-bhumayah" or "stages of effort" (Lakshmi — Tantra IV. 24 ; II. 46-47 ; III. 4), and the corresponding gunas of each set (1 and 4, 2 and 5, 3 and 6) join to form a pair, connected with some special divine manifestation.

The Pancaratra in pairing the Gunas was guided by the consideration, that in each pair there should be "bhuti" and "kriya", a stage of rest as well as a stage of effort. There is divine manifestation, but it would have been undifferentiated, and as such unknown, if it has been only bhuti. But such unmanifest bhuti is being made manifest to us, because there is along with it, the activity of kriya sakti. The two together make diversified luminosity, accessible to human sense and knowledge.

The Pancaratra teaches a chain, as it were, of emanations ; each emanation except the first, originating from an anterior emanation ; and thus the favourite image of the process has, with the Pancaratras, become that of one flame, proceeding from another flame. The first three (or including Vasudeva, four) beings thus coming into existence are called Vyuhās. This word, as suggested by Schrader, is a combination of the root *uh* "to shove" and the preposition *vi* "asunder", and apparently refers to the "shoving asunder" of the six Gunas into three pairs. This however, does not mean that each Vyuha has only its two respective gunas, but as, is repeatedly emphasized, each Vyuha is Visnu himself, with his six Gunas, of which however, two only, in each case, become manifest.

The Pancaratra Agamas accept the theory of Vyuhās or manifestations. The one Absolute identified with Visnu exists in five different modes, images and the like (arca), incarnations (vibhavas), manifestations (Vyuha) like Vasu-

deva, Samkarsana, Pradyumna and Aniruddha, the subtle (Sukṣma) form of Vasudeva or the Supreme Spirit and the inner ruler of all. Sometimes the highest mode (parā) is said to be Narayana or Brahman, living in Vaikuntha, where God is said to exist in a body made of pure Sattva. God in his infinite fullness, transcends his own manifestations. In Vaikuntha, the Lord is seated on the Serpent Śeṣa, supported by his consort Lakṣmī. Lakṣmī, the imaginative symbol of the creative energy of God, becomes in later Vaiṣṇavism, the divine mother of the universe, who sometimes intercedes with God on behalf of weak and erring humanity. While Īśvara symbolises justice, Lakṣmī stands of mercy, and the two qualities are united in the godhead. Lakṣmī, the Śakti of Viṣṇu, has the two forms of *kriyā* or the principle of regulation and control, and *bhūtī* or the principle of becoming. These answering to force and matter, enable Viṣṇu to become the efficient and material causes of the universe.

The four stages of evolution in the Pañca-rātra are known as Vasudeva, Samkarsana, Pradyumna and Aniruddha (Padma-tantra. I. 2. 21). The Vasudeva vyaṇa is the first awakening or *gunonmesa* of the self of Viṣṇu in the form of Parabrahma. This is the first manifestation of Viṣṇu from the *avyakta* stage. The Paratattva is Para-Vasudeva, who gives rise to Vyaṇa Vasudeva. One portion of Para-Vasudeva becomes Vyaṇa Vasudeva, while the rest is the form of Narayana (Introduction to Pañca-rātra—Schrader. p. 52). This Vasudeva-tattva is the first manifestation of Viṣṇu-śakti. This Viṣṇu-śakti carries on everything in the universe ; and hence, she is known as *Viśva-prakṛti*. So Lord Vasudeva is the universal *Prakṛti*. But this *prakṛti*, as opposed to ordinary *prakṛti*, is *viśuddha-sattva prakṛti* : it is not charged with the three *gunas*, *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. There is no evolution of *gunas* at this stage. The first differentiation of śakti and śaktiman is thus known as the Vasudeva-tattva. The Lord Vasudeva wishes to create, and gets Himself divided. This self-division of Vasudeva makes possible the emergency of the next vyaṇa, Samkarsana (Aḥirbudhnya. 5. 29-30). The emergence of Samkarsana from Vasudeva is beautifully expressed by some examples. This is a stage, when the sun has not yet risen, but the halo of the sun is visible on the distant horizons. Lord Vasudeva has not unfolded Himself clearly in manifest creations. But the halo of the rays of creation is encircling Him (Aḥirbudhnya. 5. 30-31). This is the Samkarsana tattva. Creation is as yet

unmanifest ; it is still in a germinal form. There is as yet no differentiation between eit and eit, or a-eit and a-eit, or again between eit and a-eit. The infinite universe, which is both eit and a-eit, suddha and a-suddha, lies unmanifest in the body of Samkarsana.

The Pradyumna vyuha takes its origin from the Samkarsana. It is at this stage that there is a split for the first time between Purusa and Prakriti. Prakriti charged with the three gunas, sattva, rajas and tamas, becomes for the first time, manifest at this stage. The evolution of Prakriti, and the cycle of creation, described in the Pancaratra, generally follow the Samkhya scheme. Pradyumna gives rise to Aniruddha. Aniruddha takes over the charge, as if, from Pradyumna and brings it to a successful completion. He creates Jada and eit with the help of kâla, and becomes the Lord of the Universe.

Vasudeva is Lord Bhagavan, endowed with all six gunas. In Samkarsana, jnana and bala manifest themselves. There are manifestations of aiswaryya and viryya in Pradyumna, and sakti and tejas in Aniruddha. Again, Pradyumna is the lord of creation (sristi), Aniruddha of maintenance (sthiti) and Samkarsana of destruction (layâ). Again, Samkarsana 'is the presiding deity of body, Pradyumna of manas or buddhi-tattva, and Aniruddha of ahamkara-tattva.

Lakshmi is the loving mother, bringing together the indifferent father, Visnu, who though possessing all six Gunas, is yet beyond them all, and the jivas, who misled by avidya, do not know the providence and wisdom of God. What little the jivas know, is very often misrepresented. It is the work of Mother Lakshmi to bring the angry or indifferent father and the erring child together. Venkatanatha in his commentary on Yamunacharyya's Catu-sloki, writes,

अस्ति कर्मार्हफलदे पतौ कृताद्वयं श्रियः ।

निग्रहाद्वारणं काले अन्धुक्षणमनुग्रहौ ॥

Sri-devi has two purposes : to intercede with the Lord not to punish, and then to ask Him to be favourably disposed to the erring child. The opinion of Visnu-eitta is also cited in this connection. He says that everyone seeks the help of Sri, who is mother to us all. The mother cares not so much for the good, as for what is dear to the child :

the father cares for both. So the father punishes ; while the mother implores the father not to do it. Lakshmi also punishes the wrong doer. Ravana perished in Sita's anger. The goddess Lakshmi has been variously called "प्रणिपात-प्रसन्ना", "क्षिप्र प्रसादिनी देवी" । She is "क्षान्तिरूपिनी, क्षमरूपिनी, अनुग्रहपया, अनन्ता ।" (114)

She is always

protecting man against evil. All the wealth of Indra and Brahma is at her disposal. The lord Visnu dearly loves Lakshmi ; so also is Lakshmi devoted to her Lord. The two are always looking at each other ; they have reached a perfect understanding and harmony between them. The Catu-sloka calls this harmony and understanding Samarasya (sloka. 3). It will be seen later on how this Samarasya is the secret of Rasa-realisation (See Ch. IX). Without her blessing, no worldly good, not to speak of liberation, can ever be attained. Lokacaryya in his "Sri-vacana" and Varāvara in his exhaustive commentary on this book, have given a detailed exposition of the loving intercession of mother Lakshmi.

It might be objected that if Paramatman be nitya-mukta, then he has no necessity of conjugal love for Lakshmi, giving rise to intense pleasure. So the analogy of Paramatman and Lakshmi as husband and wife, makes no sense. He delights in Himself (स्वरमन) But even if It be delght in Himself, there is no difficulty in His dividing Himself as man and woman, and the enjoyment is still of Himself, though in a different way. So when he had been together with Rama, He was really centred in Himself, and not divided into husband and wife. Visnu has no other object of love ; so the love for Rama means that Rama has been personified as Rati. Lakshmi also assumes diverse forms, as does Paramatman. She is Sree, Bhu, Durga, Hri, Daksina, Sita, Jayanti, Satya. Daksina is the best among all these forms, for the first enjoyment of Paramatman must begin with Daksina. Daksina shares first this blissful union with the Paramatman ; it is the pattern and culmination of the first divine bliss (Madhva-Siddhanta-Sara. Nirnaya Sagar Press. p. 23-4). Lakshmi is without a corporeal body, as the Supreme Lord is without one. (Ibid. Sutra. 72). Brahma, Rudra are all subject to death and decay. But Lakshmi is beyond the flux of change, and is aksara. She has a spiritual body. She is

thus aprakrita ; and she is the emblem of purified Sattva. The prakriti has been looked upon in two ways. The one form is jada, subject to change ; the other is changeless and free. This changeless state, free from all stains, is the Suddha-Sattva, and it is aprakrita, because it is unattainable in life. The prakriti has a completely emancipated symbolic form. The Vaikuntha and everything in it, are constituted of these symbolic triguna and panca-mahabhuta. The gods and the mukta purusas subsist or decay with the subsistence of these gunas, Visuddha Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. Everything in the world, the Vyoma and akasa, has this ephemeral as well as idealised forms ; the Vayu, also has these two forms ; the water also has these two. There is a river in between prakriti and parama-vyoma ; this is known as Viraja. Everyone who wishes to enter parama-vyoma, shall have to cross the river ; and in crossing it, shall be purified of both Rajas and Tamas. Whatever is present in prakrita form is also there in an ideational form in a more purified state in Vaikuntha.

Jiva Goswamin in "Bhagavad-Sandharva" writes,
 यत्र वैकुण्ठे रजस्तमश्च न प्रवर्तते । तयोमिश्रं सहचरं जडं यत् सत्त्वं
 तदापि न किन्तु अन्यदेव । तस्य या सुषुम्णापयिव्यमाण । मायातः परा
 भगवन्स्वरूपशक्तिस्तस्या वृत्तित्वेन चिद्रूपं शुद्धसत्त्वास्थां सत्त्वमिति तदीय
 प्रकरणे एव ज्ञाययिष्यते ।

(Sec. 49). In Vaikuntha, there are no Rajas or Tamas. There is not even Sattva, which in its substantial form, is to be acted on by them. But here there is another kind of Sattva. This is of the nature of knowledge and is known as the Suddha-Sattva. In Narada-pancaratra, says Jiva Goswamin, there is Vaikuntha-loka, constituted of six gunas and free from the three gunas, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas, and those who are not Vaisnavas cannot enter there.

लोकं वैकुण्ठनामानं दिव्यपङ्कगुणसंयुतम् ।

अवैष्णवानामप्राप्यं गुणत्रयविवर्जितम् ॥

Jiva Goswamin, says further in the Uttara-Khanda of Padma-Purana, the aprakrita character of Visuddha-Sattva in Vaikuntha has been clearly specified. This Vaikuntha is to be reached by crossing the river Viraja, where one sheds the last traces of Raja and Tamas. This world according to Jiva Goswamin, is everlasting, deathless, changeless and not subject to any limitation, and is full of Suddha-Sattva.

तस्याः पारे परव्योम्नि त्रिपाद्भूतं सनातनम् ॥

अमृतं शाश्वतं नित्यमनन्तं परमं पदम् ।

शुद्धसत्त्वमयं दिव्यमक्षरं ब्रह्मणः पदम् (50)

In Sec. 51, it is emphasized that Vaikuntha being without any aprakrita Sattva, is full of Saecchidananda ; or in other words, here truth, knowledge and delight have come to a perfect balance and harmony (51). In explaining how it is that the Suddha-Sattva is made manifest to us, Jiva Goswamin says that Suddha-Sattva is self-expressive, and is identified with a determined form (62). There is no trace of Rajas and Tamas in this Visuddha-Sattva, which constitutes the body of God.

अन्यस्य रजस्तमोभ्यामिश्रस्यापि प्राकृतत्वेन जाभ्यांश्च सम्बलितत्वाच्च
विशेषेण शुद्धत्वम् ।

This Visuddha Sattva being self-expressive and self-illuminated, is without a trace of affection, which is either Rajas or Tamas. The Lord assumes this form only to direct the devoted prayers of the worshippers and this is His manifest purpose.

In Bhagavad-Sandharva. 66, Jiva Goswamin writes how the Supreme Being cannot be without this aprakrita Visuddha-Sattva. प्राकृतगुण प्रकाशैर्भवान् केवलमनुमीयते न तु साक्षात् क्रियत इत्यर्थः । With Prakrita gunas, there can only be अनुमान, and no direct apprehension. Rasa-svadam cannot be the result of anumana, as has been firmly established by Abhinavagupta, while criticising the standpoint of Sri Sankuka. Rasa enjoyment is the result of direct apprehension ; and this can only be done, according to Jiva Goswamin (Sec. 66), when the Visuddha-Sattva, freed from all vijñana and ajñana, is reflected in our consciousness. It should also be noted that Abhinavagupta holds that Parama Siva can only be made perceptible when it seeks the help of sakti, in the form of bindu (See Ch. V.).

In Sec. 84, Jiva Goswamin further elucidates the concept. He says that Brahman is both sat and asat. He is sat, because the wide world and all Karyas are His manifestations. He is asat in the sense, He is the first cause and extremely subtle, and of the nature of Karana. The Svarupavaibhava is placed beyond both these vaibhavas or manifestations, and is of the nature of suddha-sattva, and its abode is in Sri Vaikuntha. Jiva Goswamin says further

how all avenues of jnana, kriya, artha and phala are brought to a final balance in this Visuddha-Sattva, which transcends both Sat and Asat, Sthula, and Shukshama, and indeed is a perfect balance of everything. This standpoint is strikingly similar to the Platonic idea of Good, where all oppositions are resolved, and everything has been harmoniously blended into a perfect concord.

Souls and matter are not kept separate in Ramanuja as they are kept in orthodox Samkhya, but are comprehended within the unity of the Lord's essence, and are related to the Supreme as attribute to a substance, as parts to a whole, or as body to the soul, which animates it. They are also called prakaras or modes, Sesas or accessories, niyama or the controlled, while God is the supporter (prakari), controller (niyanta) and the principal (Sesi). They are real and permanent, though subject to the control of the one Brahman in all their modifications and evolutions. If souls and matter are attributes of God, it does not mean that they are not in themselves substances possessing attributes, with their own distinct modes, energies, and activities. The illustration of the soul and body points out that the body has its own qualities, though it qualifies the soul. In Ramanuja's philosophy, the soul is never without traces of its bodily existence, and the body is never without a soul. So the soul always sharing in things which are non-soul, is of the nature of aprakrita visuddha-sattva. This hypothesis enables Ramanuja to account for the harmony of the universe, and the interaction of the reals, so as to *form one world. The world is one on account of the Supreme mind, which gives organic connection to the multiplicity of spiritual reals and a place and a function to each of them.* Souls (bhokta), matter (bhogya), and God (prerita) are three (Svet Up. 1), on account of their natural differences (Svarupa bheda), but one on account of the identity (aikyam) of the modes and substance (prakara and prakari).

Suddha-Sattva is the stuff of the body of God in his creation of nitya-bibhuti. It does not conceal the nature within. God reveals Himself as a cosmic force through His lilavibhuti with the aid of prakriti, and in His transcendental existence through His nityavibhuti with the aid of Suddha-tattva. This Vibhuti, or the principle of becoming par excellence, is the attribute of Lakshmi, so that it appears that Suddha-Sattva, without an admixture of the other

gunas, is the attribute of Visnu. For Suddha-sattva must seek the assistance of Lakshmi at the moment of creation. Pure matter, then, is a sort of spiritual matter, which exists nowhere except in pure creation.

It is suggested that Rasa and bhavas are nothing but manifestations of the Suddha-Sattva. These are Vibhuti or the principle of becoming of the soul, which itself is Being, and is beyond all flux and change. Bhavas, Rasas and the Supreme Bliss resulting from an enjoyment by this Suddha-Sattva, stand in a hierarchy. The splendour falls as we travel away from the original source. In this process of withdrawal from the original source, which marks the beginning of creation, the original is left unchanged. This process of withdrawal is characterised by the evolution of a series of pairs of opposites. It has already been seen how the Six Gunas in the Pancaratra, are not paired together haphazardly, but by selective affinity, determined by the absence of one quality in one and its presence in the other. The view that emanations leave the source of the product unchanged was again emphasized in the abhasavada doctrine of Kashmir Saivism, and Abhinavagupta's Rasa-speculations had better been looked at from this standpoint.

At the beginning of Sec. III, it was said that the concept of Visuddha-Sattva is close to the old Samkhya concept of Visuddha-prakriti. Rasa and bhavas which are rooted in Visuddha Sattva, are of the nature of gunas of this primary stuff, or dravya. Rasa being the most refined guna, is the first evolute, and is closest to the Visuddha Sattva. Pure matter is spiritual, that is, "of the nature of knowledge and Bliss", in so far as it is nowhere an obstacle to the mind, but consists, on the contrary, of nothing but wishes materialised. Rasa being only an attribute of this pure matter, is thus a state when the mind is free. This freedom from all attachments, of which Abhinavagupta speaks in Abhinava-Bharati Vol. I. p. 282-3 (G.O.S.) is liberation from all hindrances. This freedom is only attainable when the soul becomes of the nature of aprakrita visuddha-sattva.

This concept of Visuddha-sattva is not peculiar to Pancaratra. It runs throughout the speculations of the Vedantists, as also through the original exposition of the Samkhya in Patanjala. In the released condition, the souls have all the perfections of the Supreme except in two points. They are atomic in size, while the Supreme Spirit is all-pervading. Though of atomic size, the soul can enter into

several bodies, and experience different worlds created by the Lord ; but it has no power over the creative movements of the world, which belong exclusively to Brahman.

Madhva in discussing the nature of Suddha-Sattva in Madhva-Siddhanta-Sara, Sec. 36, writes,

इयं गुणानां विषमावस्थासृष्टिरित्युच्यते ॥ सृष्टिकाले सत्त्वगुणस्यामिश्रत्वा-
भावान् । साम्यावस्था तु प्रलय इत्युत्तरप्रवक्ष्यते ॥ त्रयाणामपि गुणानां
प्रयोजनमाह ॥ तत्र शुद्धसत्त्वमिति ॥ (102)

Creation being the result of an unbalance of the different gunas, with the achievement of this balance, there is an end to all creations. So what is the nature of activities of one, who is Suddha Sattva ? Madhva writes,

मुक्ताः प्राकृतदेहं लीलया गृहीत्वा तद्देहेन यथेष्ट भोगाननुभूयतद्देहं स्वेच्छयैव
त्यजन्ति ।

Such men take on the vesture of clay at their will, enjoy worldly enjoyment without any sense of attachment, and renounce these of their own accord. The soul may continue the bodily existence, so long as its prarabdha-karma is operative ; but after the prarabdha-karma has run its course, when it departs from the body, it is freed absolutely. Absolute liberation and embodied life are not compatible. The author of the Nyayamrita argues that he who has the vision of the truth, but not the grace of God, necessary to effect freedom, continues to live in the flesh. This is jivan-mukti. Complete freedom can be achieved only through the grace of God, and as such, is unattainable in aesthetic experience.

Among the four Vaisnava sects, Sree, Brahma, Rudra and Sanaka, the school of Madhva is generally known as that of the Brahma Sampradaya. The followers of Madhva, like those of the Sree sect, have accepted Lakshmi. Their deities are Lakshmi and Narayana. This sect recognises that there is a super-rational achintya-sakti of Brahman ; and this is known as अघटित-घटन-पटोयसी । This Sakti of the Paramatman is known as Lakshmi ; and she is more powerful and universal than other Gods (Madhva-Siddhanta-Sara-Padmanava. Nirnaya Sagar Press p. 13b). Sakti is of four kinds, (a) achintya sakti, (b) adheya sakti, (c) sahaja sakti and (d) pada-sakti. Of these four, achintya sakti is perfectly harmonised with Parameswara. It would be wrong to think that there cannot be any work done by achintya-sakti in Parameswara, who Himself is beyond all activities. For He is the unmoved mover, much like the Aristotelian God. He

goes without moving from his original position. He is atomic in size ; and is at the same time, all-pervasive. All oppositions are resolved in Him. All these are made possible by the achintya Sakti of the Lord. Rama or Lakshmi represents this achintya Sakti. But this does not mean that Rama or Lakshmi exhausts all achintya Sakti, and is its embodiment. Lakshmi Sakti is infinitely inferior to Paramatma-sakti ; and Brahma-sakti is again infinitely inferior to Lakshmi Sakti (Madhva-Siddhanta-Sara Nirnaya Sagar Press. p. 14a). Again, Vayu, Prithvi and all their gods are infinitesimal parts of this achintya-sakti (Ibid 14a, and 26b). Though Lakshmi and Visnu are not identical, both are eternally free, or नित्यमुक्त (Sutra. 71). This eternal freedom of Lakshmi is to be attributed to her eternal association with the Supreme Lord ; अनादिकाले भगवन् सम्बन्धित्वात् युज्यते नित्यमुक्त त्वं तस्याः । (Vivritti of Sutra. 71). Both are without a beginning. Both are deathless, true and all-pervasive. This goddess Sree is the emancipator ; she is propitiated, when worshipped with flowers and sandal-wood. She is the eternal companion of Lord Visnu. She is Chapala, Ambika and Hri. This unmanifest Sakti is identical and undifferentiated from Sristi, and exists in eight manifest forms. She is again of the nature of Cit, and is eternal and para.

Madhva also holds that Parama-atman is full of infinite qualities. Each quality is uncircumscribed, and is completely adequate unto itself. He passes all description ; He cannot even be conceived. The jnana and ananda of the Paramatman far surpass the jnana and ananda of Lakshmi. Each of His qualities is infinite or ananta. This is His sa-jatīyanantya. Again, jnana, ananda, bala and sakti being ananta, there is in Him a vi-jatīyanantya.¹¹⁵ All heard and unheard of qualities are vested in Him. Prakriti is jada. The Lord is very different from jīva, Brahman and even from the Maha-Lakshmi. He has got a body : He rules over the vast universe. But His body is not a-nitya, like the jada-deha of the ordinary jīva. It is of the nature of knowledge, and is aprakṛita. So all His limbs, His head, face, hands and fingers are all of a spiritual and subtle nature. He is unique, while the jīva is dependent on others (para-tantra). He is one, for there is none, who is His equal. None can attain a similar status with Him. The jīva is for ever para-tantra. Any attempt to reach His swa-tantra, or uniqueness is sheer folly.

Lakshmi is different from the Paramatman, and is at the same time, under His absolute control. Brahman and all others are the children of Lakshmi. They appear from Her and disappear in Her. Lakshmi is infinitely superior to the mukta in her love, adoration and knowledge (priya, bhakti and jnana) of the Lord. The Madhvas hold that at the time of pralaya, man disappears into Yama, Yama into Sudarsana, Sudarsana into Rudra, Rudra into Brahman, and Brahman Himself into Durga. After the disappearance of Brahman, Durga assumes the form of a wheel. Lakshmi, like her Lord Bhagavan, is nitya-mukta and full of all gunas. But even though she is nitya-mukta and apta-kama, she prays to God. Both Bhagavan and Lakshmi are without any beginning, and eternally free.

The Madhvas find a two-fold division in the nature of Bhagavan. These are jada and a-jada. The jada prakriti is known as avyakta, with its eight-fold division. This is what the Madhvas call a-cit. The a-jada prakriti is on the other hand, of the nature of cit and parā. The cit-prakriti is without any beginning, endless ; she is the consort of Narayana, and the mother of Brahma ; she is Sree. The Paramatman, though He is self-absorbed, out of grace to Lakshmi, enters into Her, and goes on playing as Lakshmi. Sree Bhu, Durga, Hri, Daksina, Sita, Jayanti, Bhirini, Satya, Ruksmini are all different manifestations of Lakshmi. Lakshmi can assume infinite forms and shapes. Among all these infinite varieties, Daksina is the finest and the best. She is seated on the knees of the Lord ; she is the yajna ; she is always enjoying communion, or rati-sukha with Her Lord. She is the first to enjoy this communion. This pleasure is thereafter transmitted to others. Her body is a-prakrita, like that of Her Lord. She is cin-maya and nitya.

The Madhvas hold that the mukta purusas assume out of lila, the suddha-sattva body, and leave it when the enjoyment is over. This body, being without a trace of rajas and tamas, and constituted of pure sattva, there can be no question of attachment from such enjoyment. This is also the highest ideal of Rasa enjoyment, where bhoga is not merely bhoga, but combined with the essence of tyaga (See Chs. IX and XI).

Speaking of bhoga, the Madhvas hold that it is four-fold, sa-lokya, sa-meepya, sa-rupya and sa-jujya.¹⁸ The bhoga, which is made possible through entry into the body of the Lord, and enjoyment through such a body, is known as sa-

jujya. Only the gods are entitled to sa-jujya enjoyment. The gods go on enjoying in their own beautiful bodies, as also by entering into the body of the Lord. Brahman cannot enjoy except through entering the body of the Paramatman. But everyone shall have to enter the body of Bhagavan at the time of the pralaya. At other times, the muktas can at their own sweet will, come out of Him, and once again re-enter into Swarupa. They are free. The sa-lokya muktas can enjoy whatever they may desire from anywhere in the universe. Some of them attain mukti here in this world. Others enter swarga, or may enjoy the ksira-samudra, or the ocean of sweet milk. So also it is the case with sameepya and sa-rupya bhoga. The muktas are not limited in their choice of the places of enjoyment. There is a detailed description of this wonderful land, where ksira-sagar, beautiful forests, lakes of wine and seas of nectar abound.

Lord Krishna being of the nature of Sacchidananda, brings into perfect unison the three qualities, Sat, Cit and Ananda. The Swarupa Sakti of the Lord is divided into three qualities. These three are Sandhini, Samvit and Hladini. In the Visnu-Purana. 1.12.69, these three qualities are mentioned :

ह्लादिनी सन्धिनी संवित् त्ययेका सर्वसंस्थिता ।

ह्लाद-तापकरी-मिश्रा त्वयि नो गुणवर्जिते ॥

"In you are united hladini, Sandhini and Samvit for the creation of the world ; but You without a trace of any guna, are free from all these". By hladini is meant Sattvika qualities ; by tapakari is meant Tamasa qualities ; and Rajas represents misra qualities. But the Lord who is free from the play of gunas, is only the manifestation of His own self in the forms of Sat, Cit and Ananda. Of these three are these three Saktis, Sandhini, Samvit and Hladini. By Sandhini Sakti, the Lord who is Himself of the nature of Sattva, becomes its manifestation, and also makes others share in it. This is

सर्वदेशकालद्रव्यादिप्राप्तिकरी सन्धिनी ।

Again, the Lord who is of the nature of knowledge, becomes known to Himself, and makes others know Him by Samvit Sakti. Lastly, the Lord who is of the nature of delight, comes to delight in Himself, and makes others also delight in Him by this third power of Hladini. These powers are

graduated in order of their superiority ; and hladini stands highest among these three.

The Lord possesses a self-revealing vritti, latent in this primary Sakti, which becomes His own self. When the Lord reveals Himself on account of this self-revealing vritti, it is known as Visuddha-Sattva. The vritti which is the product of Swarupa-Sakti characterised by self-expressiveness, is known as Sattva

अत्र सत्त्वशब्देन सत्त्वप्रकाशता लक्षणस्वरूपशक्तिवृत्ति विशेष उच्यते ।

It is Visuddha because it is freed from all traces of Maya, which is trigunatmika. This Visuddha Sattva is not just Sattva ; it is entirely independent from all other things. When the Sandhini power predominates it becomes "adhara-sakti". When there is dominance of Samvit, it is "atma-vidya"; and with excess of hladini, it becomes "guhya-vidya". If on the other hand, there is simultaneously the dominance of all three powers, then it is the "Murti" of God. The "adhara-sakti" with excess of Sandhini, expresses the "dhama" of God ; and the murti with equal dominance of all three powers in Vasudeva ; the Sri Vighraha evolving out of this Vasudeva, is Vasudeva.

The Lord when He is resting in His own self, is "Rasa-maya". The Upanishads identify God with Rasa. The Lord is Rasa-maya, because the best among his Swarupa-saktis, is this hladini. There are two functions of this hladini ; first it is to please God Himself as "hlada" ; the other is to gladden others, and so to give "hlada" to them. This hladini Sakti thus extends both to man and God, and is a sort of connecting link between the two. The hladini in Bhagavad-koti, gladdens the Lord, and makes Him Rasamaya. Again the hladini entering into Jiva-koti, fills the heart of the devotees with the purest delight. The delight of devotion on the part of the devotees, and the delight of Creation or "lila" on the part of the Lord—are the manifestations of the same hladini power in two distinct spheres. The hladini in the Lord is of the nature of Rasa ; the hladini in the devotee, is of the nature of bhakti. The presence of Radha in Lord Krishna, who Himself is full and complete in Himself, is in the form of eternal hladini-power. The Jivas would be filled with intense delight, if they had even a glimpse of it.

The Vaikhāṇasa and the Nimbarka branches of Vedānta also emphasize this concept of Visuddha-Sattva. The Inanimate world, according to Nimbarka, has three principal

categories (tattvas) which are (1) aprakrita, or what in Ramanuja has been called, the stuff out of which the non-natural (aprakrita) bodies of God, the angels, and the liberated souls are made, (2) prakriti with its three gunas, and (3) Kala or time. The aprakrita Vlsuddha Sattva is underived from the primordial prakriti. Rasa and Bhavas are thus to be traced as qualities of the aprakrita vlsuddha sattva ; they are only manifestations of this primary stuff whose real nature is revealed only to saints and gods.

Nimbarka wrote a short commentary on the Brahma Sutra called, "Vedanta-parijata-saurabha" as well as ten verses, Dasasloki, elucidating his view of the distinctness of Jiva, Iswara and Jagat. His commentary on the Brahma-Sutra develops the theory of transformation (parinama) of Brahman. Nimbarka draws a distinction between the independent reality of Purusottama and the dependent realities of Jiva and prakriti. While Jiva and prakriti are dependent on Purusottama, they are realities all the same. The relation of the three principles of jiva, the world and God, is not one of absolute identity or non-distinction, since such a view would contradict numberless passages of the Upanishads, which insist on difference, and will also involve confusion between the natures and attributes of the different principles. Nor can it be said that the three principles are absolutely distinct, since this would be to fly in the face of the monistic evidence of the Upanishads. Nimbarka concludes that both difference and non-difference are real. The soul and the world are different from Brahman, since they possess natures and *attributes different from those of Brahman. They are not different, since they cannot exist by themselves, and depend absolutely on Brahman. The difference signifies distinct and dependent existence (para-tantra sattabhavah), and non-difference signifies the impossibility of independent existence (svatantra satta bhavah).* Nimbarka holds that the sakti of Brahman is the material cause of the world, and the changes of sakti do not touch the integrity of Brahman. What Ramanuja calls the "body" of Brahman is the Sakti of Nimbarka.

According to Nimbarka, the acit-tattva may assume three different forms. These may be of prakrita or of an aprakrita nature, and the third is kala. The sub-strate which is being operated upon by the three gunas, is of a prakrita nature. This prakrita dravya as karana, is nitya ; but as

karya, this is a-nitya. Pradhana, Maya, Avyakta are all different denotations of this karana avastha; and all the stages from mahat-tattva to the universe as manifest creation are included under karya (See also Ch. III). The a-cit is not self-existent; it depends for its existence on the will of God. Prakriti is under the sway of Kala. Prakriti contributes to the bondage, and stands in the way of liberation of the jiva. It gets itself transformed into deha, indriya, manas and buddhi of the atman with the help of the three gunas, sattva, rajas and tamas. The prakrita portion of the acit-tattva is this visuddha-sattva. But even though it is a-cetana, it is very different from prakriti and kala. It is resplendent as the sun, and is placed outside the rule of the prakriti. It should be remembered further that nitya-bibhuti, visnu-pada, parama-vyoma, parama-pada are only different names of this aprakrita portion of the acit-tattva. It is controlled by the Lord. It assumes different forms, and pleases Him and His disciples. It is beyond the domain of Kala, and is changeless, without any parinama. Kala is ever present and comprehends everything else.

According to Nimbarka, the lordship over the universe, and its control are all vested in the Brahma. Sree Krishna or Vasudeva is this Para-Brahma. He is without any defect, the source of all that is good, of the nature of the true and the wise, without any limitation, and the embodiment of Sacchidananda. His powers cannot be comprehended in thought. He is at the same time, the beloved of the Gops, and the lord of Rama. Gopi presides over prema; Rama or Laksmi is the goddess of wealth. So the Lord is the source of all wealth, just as He is the root of all madhurya or bliss. What the Puranas describe as Satya-bhama is this Rama or Bhu-sakti. The body of the Lord is endowed with an infinite variety of benevolent qualities. It is wonderfully beautiful, tender, full of grace and sweet-scenting, full of charm and youth. It is no use finding out the presence of the different indriyas in Him, because He is all-powerful, and essentially one. Those liberated or mukta purusas, who have arrived very near to God, and those others, who are nitya, are all possessed of similar qualities. The constitution of their bodies, being dependent on the eternal and unlimited wishes of the Lord, is without death or decay. Their bodies are nitya, or without any change, just as souls are nitya. This nitya-deha is shrouded, when the jiva is in bondage. But when the jiva out of the grace of the Lord,

gets a glimpse of Him, he becomes detached from the prakṛiti, and comes to acquire his ever-lasting, deathless body. At the moment of entrance into this heavenly kingdom, the Lord grants the jīva this eternal, deathless and changeless body, with which to worship Him.

But it should not be forgotten that in Ramanuja's speculations, as also in Nimbarka, it is clearly held that though this visuddha-sattva comes under a-cit or jada-tattva, it is being always penetrated by cit, without which the existence of the a-cit visuddha-sattva would itself become an impossibility. Visuddha-sattva in Ramanuja and Nimbarka, at the behest of the Lord, who Himself is of the nature of cit, undergoes various transformations. This standpoint, where the a-cit is penetrated by cit, is not very different from the standpoint in Madhya, which looks at visuddha-sattva itself as cit. So from both standpoints, Rasa-realisation is an activity of the cit-sakti.

It should be noted again that the sakti which occupies such an important place in Ramanuja and Nimbarka, assumes the form of Prakṛiti in early Saṁkhya speculations. The Ahirbyudhna Samhita (xiii. 18-30), which gives a summary of the Sasti-tantra, perhaps refers to Sakti, when it speaks of Prakṛiti, which is held to be the store-house of energy. The term is also referred to here and there in the Ahirbyudhna, but it is difficult to ascertain the exact sense in which it is used. In ii. 57, it is defined as the material cause of the universe (jagat-prakṛiti-bhavo ya sa sakti parikṛtita), and in the hemistich vi. 16 (yat tat gunamayam rupam sakte-stasya prakṛititam),¹⁷ the term evidently speaks of prakṛiti, which is held to be the conglomeration of the gunas.

Nimbarka says that the Supreme Spirit is conceived as free from all defects. By defects, Nimbarka obviously means all that results from the activities of Rajas and Tamas. This Supreme Spirit is the storehouse of all beneficent attributes, possessed of a heavenly body (suddha-sattva), full of beauty and tenderness, sweetness and charm (Dasasloki, 4). Liberation according to Nimbarka, is not complete identification with God, which is an impossibility. At the moment when he is freed from all limitations, he comes to approximate the aprakṛita visuddha Sattva. Rasas and bhavas are possible only when such an approximation is sufficiently close. Nimbarka accepts Lord Krishna as the Supreme-Lord, or parama Brahma. The Sakti of this Supreme Lord as

analysed by Nimbarka in his Vedanta-parijata-saurabha is very similar to the analysis of Ramanuja. The followers of Nimbarka speak of Lord Krishna as "Ramapati" "Sripati"; but they hold Radhika, who is seated on the left side of Lord Krishna, and who is the fountain-head of "prema" or love, as even better than Him. In the fifth sloka of Nimbarka's Dasa-sloki, we come across,

अङ्गे तु वामे वृषमानुजां मुदा ।

विराजमानामनुरूपसौभागाम् ॥

सखीसहस्रैः परिवेदितां सदा ।

स्मरेम देवीं सकलेष्टकामदाम् ॥ (118)

Purushottamacharyya in his commentary Vedanta-ratna -manjusa, written on Dasasloki, explains the qualities of Radhika, "anurupa-saubhaga", "devi", "Sakalestakamada" much on the lines of Yamunacharyya's Catu-sloki, or the exposition of Venkatanatha of Ramanuja's concept of Lakshmi in "Gadya-traya". Radha in Nimbarka is the anapayini Sakti of Visnu in the Pancha-ratra or in the Puranas. All these different branches of Vedanta emphasize that the non-attachment and bliss in aesthetic enjoyment can only be explained, if Rasa-realisation be looked upon as manifestation of this aprakrita Visuddha Sattva.

It must have been noticed further that it was possible for the Rasa-vadins to change their philosophic position from the one, held by their master, simply because both Bharata and his interpreters, though belonging to different philosophic traditions, upheld the doctrine of sakti, in the form of visuddha-sattva. Bharata as a disciple of the Samkhya-Patanjala school (See Ch. VI) and the Vedantists as also the Pratyabhijna exponents, like Abhinavagupta, were unanimous that Rasa-enjoyment is essentially the result of a deep embrace with sakti. The philosophy of Sakti thus bridged the gulf between Bharata and the later exponents of Rasa, who are almost all of them Vedantists.

The Samkhya-Patanjala standpoint in relation to Rasa enjoyment, speaks of this concept of Sakti, when it refers to parinama, as affecting all stages of evolution. Evolution, according to the Samkhya system, is the gradual development of what existed inherently within the primary cause in a diffused state. It is the process which makes the under-developed or less developed one more developed, the inte-